



edwards hart
historic building consultants

HOP EXCHANGE HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENTS



Prepared for the Peer Group

19th May 2021

This report has been prepared by:

Professor John Edwards MA, DipBldgCons, CEnv, FRICS, FCIQB, IHBC

RICS & CIOB Certified Historic Building Professional
Accredited by the Institute for Historic Building Conservation

Director: Edwards Hart Ltd
Historic Building Consultants

Professor of Practice at the University of Wales Trinity St David

Date of issue: 19th May 2021

This report is the copyright of Edwards Hart Ltd and is for the sole use of the client and its advisors. It may not be used or referred to in whole or in part by anyone else without the express agreement Edwards Hart Ltd. Edwards Hart Ltd do not accept liability for any loss or damage arising from any unauthorised use of this report.

Assessment of the Impact of Proposals on Significance

1. Generally

This Heritage Impact Assessment supports a planning and listed building consent application by Peer Freeholds Ltd for the refurbishment and extension of the former Hop Exchange, a Grade II-listed building in the heart of the London Borough of Southwark. It should be read alongside the Heritage Statement which describes, analyses, and articulates heritage values. This document describes the impact that proposals have on that significance, through a series of heritage impact assessments (HIA's). The significance values are those described in the Heritage Statement.

HIA's are provided to cover those changes having an impact. They each reference sources along with alternative proposals with reasons why they were rejected.

HIA's have been used to help guide the proposals and its design and subsequently help justify decisions that have been made.

This statement should be read in conjunction with the Design and Access Statement by Forge Architects and the Planning Statement produced by the Planning Lab

2. Summary of Proposals

The proposals are described in the architect's documents but are generally as detailed below. We have prepared a series of heritage impact assessments (HIA) (see 4 below) and here we also detailed which HIA's that these proposals have been assessed within.

- Proposing ground floor use that increase public access to the building which involves some change of levels to facilitate ease of access (HIA C & D)
- Opportunities for allowing increasing public routes accessibility and enjoyment through of the building and via the including a new rear entrance to the atrium and central buildings, new roof terrace and opening of Cart Way which will connect Southwark Street to the front and Park Street to the rear (HIA's C, D, E & F)
- Creating platform access at the new rear entrance avoiding the need to modify the original portico for accessibility reasons. (HIA's D, E & F)
- Providing a more appropriate glazed roof to the atrium creating greater harmony with the original aesthetics (HIA G)
- Creating additional office floorspace to the upper floors, which is much more suitable for modern working requirements (HIA's E & F)
- Refurbishing the existing building fabric and reinstating any lost heritage features that may have been lost over time (HIA's A, B, D & G)
- Bringing the building into good repair and evidenced based restoration of the principal elevation (HIA's A, B & F)

3. Assessment

As will be detailed later, the HIA's conclude a positive impact on the communal heritage value with much greater public access and engagement with this historic building and increasing relevance to the community. We don't believe that there will be any negative impact on the historic value, indeed there should be greater appreciation and promotion of its history. Whilst there may be some relatively minor impact on the evidential value, the scheme is seeking to make a huge positive impact with an authentic evidence-based reintroduction of a colour scheme and other features to the principal Southwark Street elevation. This should also enhance the emotional connection with the community (communal value) and the aesthetic value, which will have a positive impact on the conservation area.

These proposals will therefore have a positive impact, but in order to facilitate that, there will be some impact on aesthetics externally, but the restored appearance of the existing principal elevation overall enhances heritage values. Internally we believe that the options proposed provides least harm to significance and indeed, there will be a substantial positive impact on aesthetics with the replacement of the roof to the atrium with a more appropriate design.

4. Heritage Impact Assessments

Proposals have been assessed with the undertaking of the following HIA's:

- A. Restoration of the existing Southwark Street elevation
- B. Alterations to windows Southwark Street
- C. New entrances Southwark Street
- D. New Ground Floor including associated alterations to basement/ lowering floor level
- E. Extending the height of the building
- F. Demolition and extension to rear including courtyard entrance enhancement
- G. New roof to atrium

These HIA's are on the following pages and in section 5 the overall impact is summarised.

A. Restoration of the existing Southwark Street elevation

Proposal & Location	Reason for proposal	Significance	Ref / Research	Possible Impact on Significance	Mitigation	Other options considered	Conclusions
<p>Decorate all finishes in a colour scheme determined from architectural paint research largely based on the 1940 scheme.</p>	<p>The current modern colour scheme does not have any authenticity and slightly diminishes significance. In order to enhance significance, an authentic appearance should be reinstated</p>	<p>The Heritage Statement indicates that this elevation has Evidential Significance, Aesthetic Significance, and some Communal Significance. It also highlights the significance of the Hop Exchange within the conservation area with specific reference to the Southwark Street elevation</p>	<p>HS sections 3.4.2.1, 3.4.4.4, 3.4.5.4, 3.6.1 and 3.6.2</p> <p>DAS pages 30 – 34, 49, 66 and 67</p>	<p>No harm – indeed, it provides substantial heritage benefits</p> <p>Evidential value – positive as it evidences the past in an authentic way</p> <p>Historical value – some positive impact, including that it contributes to generating greater historical interest</p> <p>Aesthetic value – positive impact, as it will remove the current ‘modern’ look</p> <p>Communal value – slight positive impact as it should provide interest and emotional connection</p> <p>Conservation area – positive impact</p>	<p>The colour scheme must strictly follow the results of the architectural paint research as far as practically possible</p>	<p>Leaving as it would mean retaining an inappropriate modern look – the advantage of restoring the colour scheme was highlighted by Historic England during consultation (letter date 31st March 2020)</p> <p>Architectural paint research indicated four schemes which could be all considered authentic and provide positive heritage benefits to varying degrees.</p> <p>Information on the first scheme of 1867 is uncertain and therefore knowledge of this scheme should be considered comparatively unreliable.</p> <p>Information from 1870 isn’t really a scheme option as the information reveals a dirty appearance.</p> <p>The scheme of circa 1870 – 1924 also remains a little uncertain as to the exact colour tones and therefore it would not be possible to reinstate this scheme with the required degree of certainty.</p> <p>It should be noted that all the schemes referenced above relate to the building when it was at its full height. Therefore, the colour schemes would not truly represent the appearance of the building at those periods of time.</p> <p>The 1920 – 1940 colour scheme is similar to the previous one. However, like the previous one the columns are painted in a green, whereby originally, they would have been painted in a brown colour. It could be argued that this colour change from the original is too bold to be acceptable.</p>	<p>Whilst there are a number of options available, the earlier ones would involve a degree of conjecture. Later ones which involve a colour green for columns is evidently not authentic to the original.</p> <p>The chosen colour scheme, which apart from the colour tone of the green to windows is thought to be the circa 1940 scheme. It relates to the building at its current scale, does not attempt to add unauthentic colour to columns and can be considered authentic as a complete scheme.</p> <p>Overall, this will have a very positive impact on significance and the conservation area and chimes with the views of Historic England “exciting opportunity to enhance the significance of the elevation by reinstating the original fenestration arrangement and paint scheme based on the historic research that has been carried out”.</p>

B. Alterations to windows Southwark Street							
Proposal & Location	Reason for proposal	Significance	Ref / Research	Possible Impact on Significance	Mitigation	Other options considered	Conclusions
Undertaking alterations to windows of the Southwark Street elevation that reinstates their original appearance	The windows have been altered in a crude manner in order to facilitate ventilation. This has been detrimental to the appearance of the windows themselves and the whole elevation.	The Heritage Statement indicates these parts of the windows have no significance. It also highlights the significance of the Hop Exchange within the conservation area with specific reference to the Southwark Street elevation.	HS sections 3.4.4.8, 3.6.1 and 3.6.2 DAS page 50	No harm – indeed, it provides substantial heritage benefits Evidential value – positive Historical value – positive Aesthetic value – positive impact as it reinstates the original appearance and contributes to a more complete aesthetic with the reintroduction of an authentic colour scheme. Communal value – positive Conservation area – positive impact	Ensure that the work reinstates the original design includes the same materials	Leaving as it would mean retaining an inappropriate aesthetic – this is an issue raised by Historic England during consultation (letter date 31st March 2020)	This proposal would correct mistakes that have previously been made to the appearance of the building. Therefore, the proposal will enhance heritage values of the building. Any impact on the conservation area is positive

C. New Entrances Southwark Street							
Proposal & Location	Reason for proposal	Significance	Ref / Research	Possible Impact on Significance	Mitigation	Other options considered	Conclusions
New entrances converted from existing openings.	To facilitate public access into and through the building at the same level as the external areas	<p>The Heritage Statement indicates these areas have low significance with elements that have no significance within.</p> <p>It also highlights the significance of the Hop Exchange within the conservation area with specific reference to the Southwark Street elevation</p>	<p>HS section 3.4.4.7, 3.4.5.4, 3.6.1 and 3.6.2</p> <p>DAS pages 4, 8, 10, 23, 24, 35, 36, 40, 42 and 46</p>	<p>No harm – indeed, it provides substantial heritage benefits</p> <p>Evidential value – no impact</p> <p>Historical value – no impact</p> <p>Aesthetic value – all three options of door arrangements will have little impact on significance.</p> <p>Communal value – positive, as it will facilitate public access into the building</p> <p>Conservation area – no impact</p>	Ensure that the option chosen provides harmony with surrounding elements of the building	Leaving as it is, but this would mean not facilitating public access into this historic building	<p>This proposal facilitates public access, and any impact is on elements which either have low or no significance. The advantages for the building far outweigh this impact. The change is so minor that it has no impact on the conservation area</p> <p>Also noting the comments received from Southwark Council during initial consultation that ‘new doors to Southwark Street elevation, set within the two of the columns and at the pavement level would not interrupt the rhythm of façade and would likely assist in an improved connection at street level’.</p>

D. New Ground Floor including associated alterations to basement /lowering floor							
Proposal & Location	Reason for proposal	Significance	Ref / Research	Possible Impact on Significance	Mitigation	Other options considered	Conclusions
Providing access from the front to the rear of the building by removing the existing ground floor in one area of the building. Associated with this will be removal of some of the original vaults within the basement	Increased permeability and accessibility from the front to the rear. This will bring about greater public access and increase public use. In the process it will also deal with moisture and structural issues	The Heritage Statement indicates that a small proportion of areas are of significance, but the majority of the areas affected have either some or no significance	HS section 3.4.2.8, 3.4.2.16, 3.4.2.17, 3.4.2.18, 3.4.3.3 and 3.4.5.4 DAS page 40	No harm – indeed, it provides substantial heritage benefits Evidential value – some impact on evidence of basement storage use Historical value – positive impact as it will encourage greater access into the ground floor areas of the building creating greater interest in the history of the building. Currently there is no public access Aesthetic value – some impact Communal value – positive, as it will facilitate public access into the building	Only undertake as much work as necessary in order to achieve objectives. Retain features wherever possible.	Leaving as it is, but this would mean not facilitating public access into this historic building. Other similar proposals were considered but these involved the removal of many significant features, as highlighted by Historic England during consultation (letter date 31 st March 2020). Therefore, these other proposals were rejected.	This proposal facilitates public access, and most impact is on elements which either have low or no significance. The advantages far outweigh this impact

E. Extending the height of the building							
Proposal & Location	Reason for proposal	Significance	Ref / Research	Possible Impact on Significance	Mitigation	Other options considered	Conclusions
Increase height of the building by two storeys	Partially reinstate the original height of the building providing increased lettable space which will provide income for heritage improvements elsewhere, provide public access at the upper most part of the building in addition to increasing public access generally	The Heritage Statement indicates that this Southwark Street elevation has Evidential Significance, Aesthetic Significance, and some Communal Significance. However, the rear, the West Wing and much of the upper storeys have mostly low significance overall. It also highlights the significance of the Hop Exchange within the conservation area with specific reference to the Southwark Street elevation	HS sections 3.4.2.15, 3.4.2.16, 3.4.2.17, 3.4.2.20 3.4.5.4, 3.6.1 and 3.6.2 DAS pages 4, 6, 11, 17 – 27, 29, 37, 39 - 70	Providing less than substantial harm Evidential value – some impact. New additions will clearly be read as new additions. Historical value – a positive impact as it will allow increased public access and therefore appreciation of history Aesthetic value – Some impact on the Southwark Street elevation Communal value – positive, as it will facilitate public access into the building Conservation areas – some impact	Ensure that the option chosen is subservient to the original construction, is in harmony with surrounding elements of the building, whilst having sufficient contrast to be enable easy reading that this these are new additions.	Leaving as it is, but this would mean the status quo in the current appearance of the building which has diminished its significance and the current very poor public access provision. Replication of the original building to its full height, is understood to be not technically feasible. It would also prevent the development and some of the buildings history to be read. Several proposals have been previously developed. These have been reviewed against this proposal as follows: 2003 Ridge and Partners scheme. Very modern in appearance with no harmony with the existing building. A higher extension at three storeys and built flush with the face of the Southwark Street elevation. It would steal attention to the detriment of the whole building and conservation area. 2013 Harper and Downie Scheme. This would not provide all the public access attributes of the current proposal, with use as a hotel, and not provide the other heritage benefits that the current proposals involve. 2014 Smiths of Smithfield scheme, is not a direct comparison as it did not involve extending the building 2016 Witherford Watson Mann scheme, was extensive and overbearing with three additional storeys, built flush with the face of the Southwark Street elevation. A negative impact on the conservation area.	In line with the recommendations by Historic England , providing an optimum balance in creating additional space, increased ‘public’ access and design in full and proper consideration of heritage values. Compared to other proposals, this has many more advantages, including the associated work on reinstatement of an authentic appearance to the principal elevation. This proposal will be good for the building and its sustainability going forward, but also for the conservation area in improving the external appearance and the added facility of public access to an historic building and allowing the public to have high level views across the conservation area, and the increased access to areas of the rear. The additional height will have some impact on the conservation area and views of the building from Southwark Street. But it does provide a more authentic impact in terms of height given that the building was originally much higher. Therefore, considering all issues, on balance any disadvantages are outweighed by advantages.

F. Demolition and extension to rear including courtyard entrance enhancement							
Proposal & Location	Reason for proposal	Significance	Ref / Research	Possible Impact on Significance	Mitigation	Other options considered	Conclusions
Extend building to the rear to the increased height (referred to in E) of the building, which includes demolition and access improvements to rear and side	Partially reinstate the original height of the building, provide increased lettable space which will provide income for heritage improvements elsewhere, provide public access from the rear and improve the appearance to the rear of the building.	<p>The Heritage Statement indicates that the rear, the West Wing and much of the upper storeys have mostly low significance overall including those areas to be demolished.</p> <p>It also highlights the significance of the Hop Exchange within the conservation area but only with specific reference to the Southwark Street elevation</p>	<p>HS sections 3.4.2.15, 3.4.2.16, 3.4.2.17, 3.4.2.20, and 3.4.5.4</p> <p>DAS pages 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 17 – 27, 29, 37, 39 - 70</p>	<p>Providing less than substantial harm</p> <p>Evidential value – no impact. New additions will clearly be read as new additions</p> <p>Historical value – a positive impact as it will allow increased public access and therefore appreciation of history</p> <p>Aesthetic value – positive impact.</p> <p>Communal value – positive, as it will facilitate increased public access into the building</p> <p>Conservation Area – no impact</p>	<p>Ensure that the option chosen provides the harmony with surrounding elements of the building, whilst having sufficient contrast to be enable easy reading of new additions, but not so bold or contemporary as to steal attention.</p>	<p>Leaving as it is, but this would mean the status quo in the current appearance of the building from the rear, which has diminished its significance and the current very poor public access provision.</p> <p>Several proposals have been previously developed. These have been reviewed against this proposal and are described in E.</p> <p>Alternative materials, alternative arrangements in the use of materials and different window opening sizes and proportions were also considered (see DAS page 26) and rejected as too contemporary and likely to steal attention.</p>	<p>The refinement of proposals has provided an optimum balance in creating additional space, increased ‘public’ access and indeed a ‘welcome’ from the rear and designed in full and proper consideration of heritage values. Compared to other proposals, this clearly has many more advantages.</p> <p>As regards the conservation area, a large proportion of the rear elevation is shielded by the railway meaning it is only seen in glimpses</p> <p>Any disadvantages are outweighed by advantages.</p>

G. New Roof to Atrium							
Proposal & Location	Reason for proposal	Significance	Ref / Research	Possible Impact on Significance	Mitigation	Other options considered	Conclusions
Replace existing roof	The original roof has not been in place since the building was reduced in height. The current modern roof is obtrusive and draws attention to itself. It severely detracts from significance.	The Heritage Statement indicates that the roof has negative evidential significance, some aesthetic significance	HS sections 3.4.2.20, 3.4.5.5 and 3.4.5.4 DAS pages 3, 4, 13, 15, 22 – 27, 36, 37, 39, 42, 44, 48, 49, 53, 58, 59, 71 and 72.	No harm – enhancing significance Evidential value – positive impact. It will still be read as a modern addition, but unlike the present roof, it will be in harmony with the whole interior Historical value – no impact, or perhaps a positive impact in an intangible way providing increased appreciation of its history Aesthetic value – positive impact. Communal value – leading to a positive emotional relationship with the interior	Ensuring that the Recommendations made by Historic England (letter dated 6 th November 2020), i.e., ‘elegant and understated vaulted form which celebrates the volume of this central part of the listed building’.	Leaving as it is, but this would mean retaining an element that severely impacts on significance Other designs considered and rejected were more contemporary whilst in the same overall shape, one which was similar to the existing proposal, but with shading which was asymmetrical in form. The current design is not entirely glazed, and whilst that would be most suitable, it is not feasible due to solar gain.	The refinement of proposals that has taken comments from consultation into full account and has developed a scheme that is most appropriate. Elegant, understated, following the same form as the original roof and providing a well-balanced interior. Whilst ideally the roof should be fully glazed, the solution in having shading arranged a symmetrical way provides a necessary compromise. There aren’t any disadvantages compared to retaining the existing roof

5. Overall Impact

The in-depth research and analysis of heritage values contained in the Heritage Statement provided a firm foundation for developing these proposals. It also prompted additional research such as architectural paint research in order to maximise understanding. This allowed the scheme to be developed in a well-informed way around these values, with various different options considered along the way in full consideration of significance. The undertaking of draft heritage impact assessments as the proposals were developed, achieved optimum proposals, through changes and tweaking as necessary in order to mitigate impact on significance and maximise heritage benefits. This has culminated in these final proposals, which also took on board views, opinions and advice through consultation, including those of Historic England and Southwark Council and were then formally taken through the heritage impact assessment process.

The Heritage Impact Assessments in this document (see above) have divided the proposals into groups as a way of providing an assessment of the proposals succinctly and referencing other documents in detail where this would aid the understanding of the analysis. Overall, it can be seen that any negatives are far outweighed by the positives. Along the way, previous schemes have also been considered and also assessed against the significance values, and this provides additional confidence that this set of proposals achieves the objectives of the scheme in terms of the use of the building and the sustainability of the building itself, with some important enhancement of its heritage values. The following summarises the relationship with relevant policies:

5.1 NPPF

Please refer to section 4.1.2 of the Heritage Statement

In accordance with paragraph 194 a clear and convincing case has been made to demonstrate that the proposals are justified and that any harm is outweighed by the heritage benefits. Indeed, it has been concluded that none of the proposals provide substantial harm, but there will be loss of fabric, but most of this has been assessed to have no significance. Nevertheless, we have identified substantial public benefit with much increased public access. This will provide a much-enhanced emotional link with more appropriate aesthetics that are nearer to those that are original compared to the current appearance of some of the most significant areas (e.g. Atrium roof, Southwark Street Elevation), which are detriment to the overall significance of the building. This assessment follows NPPF paragraphs 195 and 196.

5.2 The London Plan (2021)

Please refer to section 4.2 of the Heritage Statement

Policy HC1

Our approach involving a detailed analysis of significance has enabled a full and complete understanding of significance, resulting in proposals that impact on areas with low significance, but also identified where there is significance. This has been the starting point in developing proposals. The development of proposals have taken a lengthy cautious approach, which has allowed proposals to evolve with the benefit of advice through the consultation process and be processed through draft heritage impact assessments

5.3 Southwark's Development Plan

Please refer to section 4.2 of the Heritage Statement

In accordance with P18, the proposals succeed in conserving those parts of the structure that are significant and indeed enhances it. This is most notable with the restored appearance of the Southwark Street elevation and the roof to the atrium. The impact on the conservation area has also been considered with a view of enhancing it. By slowly progressing to finalising viable proposals by taking advice and through the development of draft heritage impact assessments, has allowed the proposals to be robustly justified. This has involved looking at various alternatives and their advantages and disadvantages, as detailed in the heritage impact assessments in section 4.



edwards hart
historic building consultants