

**TEN TRINITY SQUARE
LONDON EC3**

**ADDENDUM TO HISTORIC BUILDING ARCHITECT'S REPORT
FEBRUARY 2009**

To be read in conjunction with
Historic Buildings Architect's Report, November 2008



Donald Insall Associates
19 West Eaton Place
London SW1X 8LT

February 2009

Background

Changes to the application scheme have altered aspects of the design which relate to proposed buildings to the north of 10 Trinity Square. This report provides a revised section 5 for the Historic Building Architect's Report of November 2008, and supersedes it.

5.0 COMMENTARY ON THE PROPOSALS

5.1 Description of the Proposals

5.1.1 Generally

The proposals are set out in Woods Bagot's drawings listed in Appendix VI.

In general terms, the proposals seek to provide the listed building with new uses as a hotel with some residential accommodation. The intention of the proposals is that the new uses will be of a quality and sensitivity that will be appropriate for the building. The proposals seek to remove the later 20th century courtyard and roof-top extensions, and excavate further basements, re-building these areas with high quality modern design to create a rotunda and extend the accommodation at roof level. The basements would provide space for plant rooms, service areas and a ball room and some hotel rooms. The ground floor would have hotel rooms, lobbies and receptions. Above this, to the third floor, would be hotel rooms and suites and, above this, three storeys of residential accommodation, including two extra storeys as an extension set back above the current double mansard level.

In addition, the Seething Lane garden and the service road to the west of the building would be excavated and new basements created to accommodate car parking and plant rooms. These would be accessed via new pavilions designed to be contemporary structures to complement a redesigned and re-landscaped garden. That at the south would be ovoid in plan form and that at the north rectangular. While contemporary in design, the pavilions reflect Cooper's original intention to construct such buildings flanking the garden (see plate 11).

To save unnecessary repetition in the descriptions below, there are some elements that will be demolished or removed on a general basis, these include:

- The 1970 Centre Block (courtyard) building would be demolished in its entirety.
- The services and plant generally would be removed completely and replaced.
- Some of the courtyard facing windows would be removed, but they would generally be blanked off on the courtyard side, but their casements would be retained.
- All modern raised flooring and suspended ceilings would be removed in their entirety.

In addition, there are certain elements of construction that would repeat at each level:

- All of the existing lift shafts would be re-employed to provide access to the residential accommodation. These lifts include those existing in the three corner pavilions – NWP, NEP and SWP – and those off the FPS and FPN staircases. The former would be extended to the new sixth floor; the latter would be within the existing construction. Otherwise vertical circulation would be either by the existing staircases or by new lifts and staircases within the new construction within the new courtyard extension. The lift in WG4 (and above) would be replaced to serve as access for disabled people in the hotel from lower ground floor to the second floor.

- New service risers and drain runs would, as far as practical, be within the new construction within the new courtyard extension. However, service risers for drains would be necessary in the original building.
- All existing decorative balustrades of open well staircases (FPS, FPN, SWSt, NWSt and NEST) and to the mezzanine gallery overlooking the entrance hall (FF1) would, to comply with Building Regulations, have to be raised. This would be accomplished by inserting an additional rail at the bottom of their panels matching the existing construction.

The building would be made fully DDA compliant and sustainability issues would be addressed. The retained perimeter windows would be fitted with secondary glazing.

Otherwise the proposals would result in the conservation, repair and restoration of all of the retained elements of the building including: the stonework to the perimeter elevations and, where visible, the courtyard elevations; all of the original staircases; all of the fine rooms on the second floor; the entrance hall and lobby; and the fine plasterwork and joinery generally.

5.1.2 **Basement Proposals**

Demolition here would be largely restricted to removing secondary sub-divisions which would allow original structural volumes to be opened up.

The existing spaces in the southeast corner would be opened up, by the removal of the lower ground floor slab, to also form a double storey height space. This would be employed as a pre-function lobby area with new staircases linking to the existing FSP and FNP staircases. Smaller spaces below the entrance steps area in the southeast corner would be fitted out as WCs and cloakrooms.

In addition at this level the courtyard would be excavated and the two existing areas of basement extended and linked by the creation of a new ballroom which would be a double storey height space extending to the lower ground floor above.

The new central ballroom area would, at this level, link to the new car parking and service basements below the Seething Lane garden.

The existing spaces in the northwest corner would be fitted out as kitchens.

5.1.3 **Lower Ground Floor Proposals**

Demolitions here would see the removal of the floor structure to the spaces below the ground floor entrance hall to form the double storey height pre-function space described above. Also in common with the basement, the entire area of the courtyard would be excavated to form the upper level of a new ballroom (described above) at this level surrounded by new accommodation with WCs and spa reception.

Otherwise, demolitions would be largely confined to the removal of sub-divisions of no quality respecting the original plan forms and structural pattern.

Openings would be widened to link both the FPN and FSN staircases to new staircases in original apsidal structures in the new pre-function area. New openings would also be created here to link to the new accommodation in the courtyard area.

In terms of re-modelling and re-planning, the south and east wings would be re-configured with their corridors to the courtyard side and the remaining spaces subdivided to form hotel rooms. These would respect the existing structural pattern of the building.

The west wing would be rather more open plan with pool, gym and movement spaces, while the north wing would be sub-divided as a series of treatment rooms, with a central corridor reflecting the original plan form.

The three corner pavilions' existing cellular structure would be respected with the NEP and SWP areas converted to hotel rooms related to the south and west wings, and the NWP forming part of the treatment room suites of the north wing.

The principal staircases FPS and FPN would be restored with the removal of modern rooms built within their wells.

The lightwell wall on the west elevation would be removed and re-constructed in facsimile as part of the creation of the new parking and servicing basement structures. This would require the dismantling and re-erection of the balustrade piers, railing and lamp standards.

The south wing courtyard facing window openings would either be infilled or their aprons would be lowered to form doorways or openings. The west wing courtyard facing window openings would be infilled to the south but the north retained as blind windows. The north wing courtyard facing windows would be treated as a mixture of new openings, with casements removed and aprons lowered, or as blind windows. The east wing would be infilled and left blind or have aprons lowered to form new openings. Infilled openings would reflect the geometry of the construction.

5.1.4 **Ground Floor and Mezzanine Proposals**

Demolition here would see:

- Opening up on the northwest wall of FG1.
- Removal of modern WCs off FSP and FNP.
- Removal of partitions and opening up to FG1 in SG3 and EG4.
- Removal of partitions in SG4, EG3, WG4 and WG5.
- Removal of window aprons to form doorways to the courtyard in SG1, EG1, NWSt, SWSt, NESt and WG5 in discrete locations in NG1.
- New openings in SG2, WG3, WG2, NG2, NG3 and EG2.
- Removal of sub-divisions in EG2.
- The removal of the loading bay and dock on the west elevation and the restoration of the doorway.
- The removal of modern raised floors in the NWP entrance.

The proposals would result in the following:

- The construction of an extension in the courtyard that would be a modern recreation of the original rotunda surrounded, within the spandrels between the courtyard wall and the new circular planned structure, by new accommodation which would include kitchens and WCs but also a library and administration offices. There would be additional accommodation above in a mezzanine. This would include private dining suites on the south wing, hotel room bathroom suites on the west and north wings and administrative offices on the east wing.
- The south wing would be converted to restaurant use with a new mezzanine, below which would be a new mezzanine and which would be accessed by new free-standing staircases. At the lower level where the windows would be removed and aprons lowered, these openings would be largely retained as openings, but infilled at the east end. At the mezzanine level there would be doors to two openings, but otherwise infilled. Infilled openings would reflect their original geometry.
- In the South West Pavilion, rooms SG2 would be fitted out for private dining and WG3 as a hotel room, within which would be a new dividing element subdivided to contain sanitary equipment. This would be free-standing and would be of a minimum height and designed to act as a piece of furniture. The doors to each room would be re-located. The original doors would be restored in SWSt to lead to the new rotunda from the SWP entrance.
- The west wing would be sub-divided into hotel rooms with three bays to either side of a restored entrance corridor from the Seething Lane garden. The entrance would be at street level and new flights of steps would lead to ground floor level. New doors would lead from the corridor into the new rotunda. The hotel rooms would be constructed within the discipline of the original structural grid and would have mezzanines on the courtyard side with bathrooms off at mezzanine level. The mezzanine would be accessed by new staircases. The window openings to the courtyard side would, at ground level, be largely infilled with casements retained but at the upper level they would generally be employed as doorways to bathrooms. Infilled openings would respect the geometry of the original windows.
- The North West Pavilion would be treated as the southwest pavilion, but here both NG2 and WG2 would be fitted as hotel rooms.
- The north wing would, again, be sub-divided as hotel rooms. Here the rooms' configuration would be similar to those in the west wing, but here accessed off a continuous corridor on the courtyard side. Here again there would be mezzanines accessed by new staircases and the layouts would respect the original structural grid of the space. At ground level the windows to the courtyard would be largely infilled with casements retained, but at the upper level they would be employed as doorways and openings to bathrooms. Infilled openings would respect the geometry of the original windows.
- The North East Pavilion would be treated in a similar manner to the SWP but

here EG2 would be the Manager's Office.

- The east wing would be sub-divided with its southernmost three bays forming a reception and otherwise its northern part administrative offices. In the latter on the courtyard side would be a mezzanine suite accessed by an accommodation staircase. On the courtyard side at ground level the window openings would generally be employed as doorways or openings, but on the mezzanine they would generally be infilled with only two openings. Infillings generally would reflect the geometry of the original window openings.
- The Entrance Block F would be largely retained in its existing form. Doorways would be re-opened of the apsidal ends of FG1, as they were originally, as would be openings to the new rotunda in the northwest wall. At first floor level new openings would be made in the same wall and modelled to reflect those existing in the southeast wall opposite.

5.1.5 First Floor Proposals

Demolitions here would see:

- The creation of openings in the courtyard and elevation walls to the south end of the east wing, the east end of the south wing and the centre of the north and west wings.
- Stripping out WCs off FF1 and in NEP and SWP.
- Removal of partitions in SF1, EF1, WF1, NF1, SF2, WF3, WF2, NF2, NWP, NF3 and EF2.
- Removal of service risers and lift shafts in NF1 and WF1.
- Creation of new openings in SF2, WF3, WF2, NF2 and NF3.
- The creation of new openings in the northwest wall of the Entrance Block.

The proposals would result in the following:

- The courtyard extension described above would carry up to form new accommodation around a central light well above the new rotunda. This accommodation would link through to that existing employing the new openings formed in the existing courtyard wall by the removal of the windows and their aprons. This accommodation would generally house new hotel rooms with their bathroom suites within the existing building envelope. In the three corners to the southwest, northwest and northeast would be accommodation staircases off the existing staircases.
- In the south wing the accommodation would be sub-divided into hotel rooms with a central corridor generally reflecting the original structural geometry of the building. The window openings on the courtyard side would generally be employed as doorways or openings, but where infilled would respect the original geometry of the construction.
- In the South West Pavilion the window opening off SWSt would be converted to a doorway to link to the new staircase in the new courtyard extension. SF2 and WF3 would be sub-divided to form hotel rooms with bathrooms both with new doorways to match those existing.

- The west, north and east wings would generally be similar to the south wing.
- The North West and North East Pavilions would generally be similar to the South West Pavilion.
- The Entrance Block would have the new openings in the northwest wall modelled to match those opposite in FF1 (see ground floor above).

5.1.6 Second Floor Proposals

Demolitions here would see:

- New openings formed in the northwest wall of FS1.
- Stripping out of WCs off FSP and FNP and in SWP, NWP and NEP.
- Windows and aprons removed in WS10, WS9, off WS11, WS8 and WS7.
- The partition between WS1 and WS2 removed and a new opening formed in the north wall of WS3.
- The removal of the pilasters in SS8 and WS11 and their reinstatement to a greater depth.
- Creation of new openings to WS1, NS2, NS3 and ES2.
- The removal of service riser shafts in NS1 and partitions in ES1, ES2 and NS2.
- The creation of an opening in the courtyard wall to ES1.

The proposals would result in the following:

- The courtyard extension described above would carry up to form new accommodation generally similar to that described at first floor level particularly to the north and east wings and in the three corners. The difference here would be that the courtyard accommodation off the fine rooms WS8, WS9 and WS10 would form part of their suites of hotel accommodation and that adjacent to SS5, SS6 and SS7 would be a kitchen.
- In all of the fine rooms SS1 to SS7 and WS1 to WS10 the fan coil unit casings would be replaced.
- In the fine rooms facing the courtyard, WS8, WS9, WS10, SS5, SS6 and SS7 the windows would be made blind by infilling on the courtyard side. The casements would be retained in place. In rooms WS8, WS9 and WS10 one window would be converted to a doorway with casements to match the existing windows.
- The fine rooms would be used as meeting rooms generally in the south wing and, in the west wing, two suites and a private dining room.
- The corridors WS11 and SS8 would be re-modelled with the original pilasters made deeper. This would involve replacing the flanking elements of each pilaster with joinery to match.

- A new door would be installed between WS3 and WS2, this would be of a similar pattern to others in the suite.
- WS1/2 would be fitted out as a bathroom suite attached to WS3 which would be a hotel room.
- The WCs would be re-fitted off FNP and FSP, and in SWP.
- The window openings to SWSt, NWSt and NESt would be made blind, but the casements retained.
- The NEP corner room would be re-fitted as a suite.
- New openings in FS1 would be fitted with doors matching others in the room, which would access a pre-function area in the new courtyard extension.
- Alterations in the north and east wings would be similar to those in the wings on the first floor.

5.1.7 **Third Floor Proposals**

Demolitions here would see:

- Removal of partitions in ST1, WT3, NWP, NT2, NT1, ET2 and ET1.
- Stripping out of WCs off FNP and FSP and in SWP and NWP.
- Removal of service risers and lift shafts in NT1 and WT1.
- Creation of an opening in the courtyard wall of ET1.

The proposals would be similar to those at first floor with each wing extended into the courtyard being employed as hotel rooms. The material differences here would be:

- The corner staircases SWSt, NWSt and NESt windows would be made blind, but the casements would be retained.
- The lift in the west wing would not raise to this level.

5.1.8 **Fourth Floor Proposals**

Demolition here would see:

- The removal of the supporting structures to the south, west, north and east wings and the mansard structures.
- The removal of a small service staircase off FSP and associated partitions to SIV1.
- The stripping out of WCs in SWP, NWP and NEP and off FNP and FSP.
- The removal of partitions in WIV3, SIV2, NIV2, NIV1, NIV3, EIV1 and FIV1, 2 and 3.
- The removal of the lift shaft and service risers in WIV1 and NIV1.
- The creation of new openings in FIV1 and FIV2 and to the courtyard wall in FIV3 and FIV1.
- The removal of the modern extensions to the corner pavilion staircases in

SWP, NWP and NEP.

The proposals would result in:

- The courtyard extension described above would carry up in a similar form to that previously described. Here, however, it would form apartments accessed off corridors created on the corridor sides of the wings and, otherwise, off large apartments in the Entrance Block (FIV1 to 3) accessed off FSP and FNP staircases.
- The removal of the fifth floor and replacement structure would mean that the structural layout would be completely changed. Each wing would be similar with a single apartment in the south and east wings and two in the north and east wings. The corner pavilions would remain in their existing form and re-used as plant rooms open to the fifth floor above. The staircase windows in NEP, NWP and SWP would be infilled to be blind casements and further fire doors would be added. Otherwise the courtyard facing windows would be infilled with retained casements blind, infilled or altered to form openings or doorways.
- Window openings in the courtyard wall would either be infilled with casements retained blind, or employed as openings or doorways. Where infilled this would respect the geometry of the opening.

5.1.9 **Fifth Floor**

The fifth floor wings would be entirely demolished and re-built to be contiguous with the new courtyard extension described below. Existing plant areas below the tower would be retained.

Otherwise the towers above the five staircases would be stripped out and each would be employed as plant rooms.

The original lanterns and laylights to the corner pavilion staircases in SWP, NWP and NEP would be restored at this level.

5.1.10 **Sixth Floor and Above**

All of the various modern plant rooms and miscellaneous structures at roof level would be removed. The sixth and seventh floors, outside of the tower, would be entirely new construction and would include extended lift towers above the SWP, NWP and NEP pavilions.

In the tower there would be some opening up of lanterns to provide openings to plant at fifth floor level, but at the seventh floor and above, an apartment would be created, accessed by a new lift from the sixth floor. Generally the tower apartment would be fitted out within the existing robust structures which would remain largely unaltered.

5.1.11 External Alterations

The existing building would, to the street elevations, be restored largely to its existing form. The mansards would be re-constructed to all intents and purposes in facsimile and roof top plant rooms and other structures would be removed. The mansard roofs would have a balustrade added (set back to not be visible) and, as previously stated, the corner pavilion lift towers would be extended.

The most extra storeys on the building would be expressed in a modern form set back above the mansard.

Other, minor, changes would be the restoration of the windows at ground floor level at the east end of the north elevation and the north end of the west elevation. As previously stated, the loading bay and dock would be removed on the west elevation to be restored, and the area balustrade and lamp standard would be removed to allow the re-building of the area wall. In addition the Seething Lane garden would be re-landscaped and new pavilions built to provide access to basement level car parking and other services.

The modern buildings in the west area on the north elevation would be removed and the area restored.

5.2 Implication of the Proposals

5.2.1 Generally

The two principal areas where the proposals would have an impact on the building are:

- Its setting, which would be affected by the extensions to the courtyard and roof.
- Its internal fabric, which would require to be altered to enable it to be employed for its new uses.

These issues are dealt with in more detail below but, in general terms, the new extensions are designed so that they would not generally be visible in close proximity to the building but, particularly, the most significant views from the southeast and especially in views from the Tower of London World Heritage Site would be inconsequential. These issues are addressed elsewhere in this application by Professor Robert Tavernor.

The proposed extension in the courtyard seeks to restore the original Beaux Arts concept of the building by introducing a new destination space at its hub. This would not replicate the architecture of Cooper's rotunda, but would replicate its intention and in doing so would create a remarkable new architectural space that would, nonetheless, allow penetration of the building from all of the original entrance locations.

The proposed re-landscaping of the Seething Lane garden with the addition of the two pavilions would mean that the publicly accessible open space would be extended, while removing the rather ugly service road which detracts from the setting of this

west elevation with its mean surface and unfortunate loading bay dock. The garden, while charming and not without interest, is rather overgrown and gloomy outside of the summer months, and its railings and other architectural elements are of limited interest or quality. The proposed new pavilions, reflecting Cooper's intention in a contemporary idiom, would provide interest and enclosure to a re-designed green space.

The new accommodation provided below the Seething Lane garden would ensure that the new use for the building would be viable. Clearly a hotel requires servicing and car parking. To be able to accommodate all of this facility within new structures discrete from the listed building and in a location that is only visible in the form of two pavilions would prove an imaginative and ingenious solution. That it would result in the removal of an ugly service road and modern loading bay is an added bonus.

Regarding the alterations, in general terms the areas that would be most significantly affected by the proposals – the existing courtyard building and the existing roof top mansard structures – are all of the 1970s period of post-war re-construction. Otherwise internal re-fitting and alterations, particularly to the courtyard wall, would aim to respect the geometry and structural integrity of the original building and are largely restricted to areas that are not the most significant in the building.

The alterations to allow hotel uses would require the wings of the building, in particular, to be sub-divided. While from its earliest days these were expected to be so treated, the building was, of course, sub-let in some areas and early plans show sub-divisions, some of the areas are more sensitive than others. The north wing on the ground floor, in particular, was less affected by bomb damage than others and, consequently, retains heavily enriched plasterwork. The intention in this wing, and the other ground floor wings to be employed as hotel rooms, would be that the sub-divisions would entirely reflect the structural layout of the architectural spaces and mezzanines installed. This would ensure that the architectural integrity of such spaces would not be compromised.

Otherwise the proposals would mean that all of the most significant internal spaces: the fine rooms on the second floor; the entrance hall and lobby; the principal and corner pavilion staircases; and the tower (board) room are all preserved with minimal intervention. Typical alterations in these rooms would include the conversion of some window openings on the courtyard side into new doorways – these would be treated as casements matching those remaining which would, otherwise, be treated as dummy windows.

In the same way, the proposed extension in the courtyard would result in windows onto it being either re-modelled as doorways or openings, or infilled either as dummy windows or as blind openings. The courtyard elevation, while not without interest as original construction, is pragmatic and of little architectural value. The proposals would reflect its location and nature as part of the original construction. Indeed, where exposed with the new extension, the ashlar finish of the wall would be exposed and there would be a clear differentiation between the modern architecture of the extension and the more traditional fabric of the original building emphasising rather than hiding the history of construction.

Addressing other general issues. To re-use the existing lift shafts would mean the original plan form and use patterns of the building would be reflected in its new employment. The extension of the corner pavilion lift shafts would be a relatively minor addition to the roofscape and, overall, would not detract. Otherwise the proposals to locate new lifts and, as far as possible, new services with new construction would help restrict the alterations required in the historic building. Clearly, however, the proposals would result in service penetrations in the original fabric and it is proposed that, generally speaking, these would be contained with new partition constructions, except in the second floor accommodation where the corridor linings would be adapted to allow penetrations. The opportunity to re-plan and extend the building in the way proposed would allow the plant to be removed from the rooftops into discrete locations. This would result in a clear and clean architectural expression which would be of benefit to the setting of the building.

The approach to heating and ventilating the rooms, particularly the fine rooms on the second floor, would be to re-use existing vent grilles in ceilings and elsewhere and otherwise replace the existing bulky fan coil units that intrude into the rooms with new slimmer versions that would allow the windows to be dressed properly. In the Tower room, modern grilles would, indeed, be removed and the original joinery restored. All of these proposals would be advantageous to the setting of these important historic rooms.

The proposals would see historic joinery and plasterwork retained generally. Where elements of door joinery would be removed, original fabric would be salvaged for re-use elsewhere in the building. Where the accommodation is to be set up as hotel rooms with new sub-divisions and new suspended ceilings, any original fabric would be left within the new construction. New door joinery to new openings would be to match original patterns in the building, generally on the courtyard side new doorways which would replace windows would be formed as French windows imitating the existing casements, otherwise in circulation spaces the typical copperlight glazed patterns of the original construction would be employed and to the rooms panelled doors or otherwise to match existing patterns.

Alterations to allow the staircases to comply with modern regulations would be discrete and would not affect their special interest.

Making the building DDA compliant would help ensure that it is viable in the long term by providing a once and for all permanent solution for this particular issue.

The proposals to install secondary glazing to the perimeter windows is a sensible and pragmatic solution to upgrading the building's sustainability.

The proposals to include the conservation, repair and restoration of the historic fabric and interiors would clearly be welcomed.

5.2.2 Basement Proposals

The alterations and extension of the basement would be to basic original fabric or fabric that has been previously altered. See also 5.2.3 below.

5.2.3 Lower Ground Floor Proposals

The fabric to be removed in the lower ground floor has been heavily re-modelled and, anyway, was never of the highest quality. The alteration to allow the creation of a ball room extension with a pre-function space would enable new high quality rooms to be formed, one in entirely newly constructed fabric and another in altered original fabric of limited value.

The alterations here would help provide the new hotel use with viability and would create a new function space appropriate to the quality of the building and its location in the City of London.

Other benefits would be the removal of the modern enclosures at the foot of the FPN and FSN staircases.

Otherwise the alterations would respect the original configuration of the building and would be benign in their effect on any special interest.

5.2.4 Ground Floor and Mezzanine Proposals

The proposed demolitions at these levels would result in:

- The restoration of the original openings on the northwest wall of FG1, lost with the post-war re-building of the entrance hall and rotunda.
- The loss of modern WCs in FSP and FNP of no significance.
- The restoration of the original doors and circulation patterns from the entrance hall into the principal staircases, and the restoration of original doors into SG3 and EG4 from the entrance hall.
- The loss of plain original but re-modelled partitions in SG4 and EG3. The loss of modern partitions in WG4 and WG5.
- The creation of new openings and sealing up of original openings in original plain partitions in SG2, WG3, WG2, NG2, NG3 and FG2. Original door joinery in these locations would be re-used in the new openings.
- The loss of modern sub-divisions in EG2.
- The re-modelling of the original opening altered in the post-war years to form a loading bay/dock, to be replaced by a new doorway.
- The restoration of the original proportions and finishes of the NWP entrance.

The new courtyard extension would, at this level, in effect re-create the original rotunda building linked through to the original entrances, re-creating the Beaux Arts intention of Cooper's design. It would contrast with the original building but would respect its form.

Structurally the new courtyard building would be independent of the original fabric and would not take support from it. It would be designed to express its period and detailed to express a clarity of construction that would allow the original fabric to be clearly identified in both material and stylistic terms, reflecting where the old and new construction commences and finishes with a clear boundary at the original courtyard wall.

The alterations would see the north and west wings converted to hotel rooms with new mezzanines. Construction here would reflect the sensitivity of these areas, particularly the north wing, and original ceilings and other ornamental plasterwork would be exposed. Alterations in the other wings would also respect the original architecture with the tall spaces retained on the external wall side but some galleries and mezzanines installed on the courtyard side – again respecting the architectural finishes and structural layout of the building generally.

Alterations in the corner pavilions would result in the restoration of the entrance in NWP, and alterations in the adjacent rooms would be benign in terms of the building's special interest.

The entrance hall's northwest wall would be re-modelled with new openings at ground and mezzanine level. This wall was re-finished as part of the post-war reparations and the proposals would see the original openings to the rotunda restored. The mezzanine openings would reflect the construction opposite on the southeast wall and would be to fabric of the post-war re-modelling. Overall these alterations would be of benefit to the special interest of the building as they reflect the original form of the building and would help to re-create the original Beaux Arts plan form.

In addition, the re-creation of the openings in the apsidal ends of the entrance hall would restore the logical original plan form and would be a positive restoration.

5.2.5 First Floor Proposals

The proposed demolitions at this level would result in:

- The loss of elements of the original courtyard wall.
- The loss of modern WCs of no significance off FF1 and in NEP and SWP.
- The loss of modern partitions in SF1, EF1, WF1, NF1, SF2, WF3, WF2, NF2, NWP, NF3 and EF2.
- The removal of modern service risers in NF1 and WF1.
- The opening of new door openings in original plain partitions in SF2, WF3, WF2, NF2 and NF3. Here original door openings would be infilled, but the door joinery would be salvaged and re-used.
- The opening up of openings in the post-war re-built northwest wall of the entrance hall (see 5.2.4 above).

The courtyard extension here and above would reflect the ground level construction, as would its relationship with the original building and its structural form.

The conversion of the wings to hotel use would generally reflect the original plan form with central corridors and rooms off respecting the structural layout. Here there would be false ceilings and new partitions. Original finishes would be retained within this new construction.

Alterations in the corner pavilions would be benign in terms of the building's special interest. The replacement of the corner staircase windows with doors would result in the introduction of new door joinery matching others onto the staircases.

5.2.6 Second Floor Staircases

Demolitions at this level would result in:

- New openings in original dummy openings on the northwest wall of FS1 (the tower room).
- The loss of modern WCs off FSP and FNP and in SWP, NWP and NEP.
- The removal of original windows and other fabric to create new doorways in WS10, WS9, off WS11, WS8 and WS7.
- The loss of an altered original partition between WS1 and WS2 and the creation of a new doorway in WS3. The latter would be fitted with new door joinery to match others in the suite.
- The re-modelling of the original corridor wall linings in SS8 and WS11 to accommodate services.
- The formation of new openings in original plain partitions in WS1, NS2, NS3 and ES2. Original doorways in these rooms would also be infilled but their door joinery re-used.
- The removal of modern service risers in NS1 and modern partitions in ES1, ES2 and NS2.
- The loss of original fabric of the courtyard wall in ES1.

The courtyard extensions here would reflect the descriptions above.

The alterations in the fine rooms would largely be as described in 5.1.1. The rooms would be restored but alterations would include the replacement of modern fan coil units and the replacement of some windows with French casements on the courtyard side. Otherwise ventilation in these rooms is proposed to be by employing existing ceiling grilles, some of these would have to be opened up, but this would not affect the special interest of the building.

The alterations in the corridors WS11 and SS8 would allow services to pass through this floor without affecting the more sensitive spaces, but would require the re-

modelling of the corridor's original panelled linings.

Alterations in the tower room FS1 would see the original blind openings in the northwest wall opened up. Originally this wall had only a single opening to its centre – this was infilled in the post-war works. The new doors to be inserted would be designed to match those on the southwest and northeast walls. Otherwise the hideous modern grilles in the northwest wall would be removed too. While the loss of the high quality walnut veneered panels in the dummy openings would be regrettable, it would be salvaged for re-use and the new openings would allow this magnificent space to be better used and overall the alterations here would be at most neutral in their effect on the special interest of the building.

The effect of the proposed alterations to re-model the north and west wings would be similar to those described in 5.2.5 for the similar wings on the first floor.

Other alterations at this level would be largely benign in terms of their effect on the special interest of the building.

5.2.7 **Third Floor Proposals**

The demolitions proposed at this level would result in:

- The removal of modern partitions in ST1, WT3, NWP, NT2, NT1, ET2 and ET1.
- The removal of modern WCs of no significance off FNP and FSP, and in SWP and NWP.
- The removal of modern service risers and lift shafts in NT1 and WT1.
- The loss of an area of original courtyard wall in ET1.

The result of the proposed alterations at this level would be similar to those on the first floor overall. Alterations proposed to the fenestration in the corner pavilion staircases would be similar to those on the second floor.

5.2.8 **Fourth Floor Proposals**

The demolitions proposed at this level would result in:

- The removal of supporting structures from the 1970s alterations which added a further floor of accommodation to the mansarded structure.
- The loss of a staircase not of the original construction of FSP with its associated post original partitions.
- The loss of modern WCs of no significance in SWP, NWP and NEP and off FNP and FSP.
- The removal of modern partitions in WIV3, SIV2, NIV2, NIV1, NIV3, EIV1 and FIV1, FIV2 and FIV3.

- The loss of modern lift shaft and service risers in WIV1 and NIV1.
- The creation of new openings in plain original fabric in FIV1, FIV2, and loss of original fabric in the courtyard wall in FIV3 and FIV4.
- The removal of the flights and the roof structures of the staircases in SWP, NWP and NEP would see the removal of fabric of the 1970s extension. Original fabric, in the form of laylights, would be re-used in the re-constructed staircases.

The effect of the proposed alterations would be to remove the 1970s structures related to the rooftop extension at that time. Outside of the courtyard wall, all of the fabric in the wings at the fourth floor was almost entirely replaced during the 1970s work and it is this that would be replaced. Similarly the alterations in the entrance block (FIV1 to 3) would see removal of fabric of an even later period of alteration. None of these changes would affect the special interest of the building.

Otherwise the proposals would see the mansard re-created largely in its surviving form with both fourth and fifth floors of dormers restored.

5.2.9 Fifth Floor Alterations

The demolition here would result in the removal of the 1970s rooftop extensions and fitting out from that date or later, none of which is of any lasting significance.

The mansard roofs on both external and courtyard elevations would be re-created largely in their surviving forms.

5.2.10 Sixth Floor and Above

All of the plant rooms that would be removed are of the 1970s or later alterations. Their removal would be a benefit to the setting of the listed building.

The extended lift towers above the corner pavilion lifts would be constructed in Portland stone to match the construction below and this alteration would have limited impact on the special interest of the building.

The alterations to the tower to allow its conversion to residential use would be relatively minimal. It is, anyway, robust original fabric of an engineering quality and it could, certainly, be altered and fitted out for such a purpose without losing these characteristics.

5.2.11 External Alterations

Perhaps the most contentious alterations to the building are those that affect its setting and particularly those that affect its setting adjacent to the Tower of London World Heritage Site. These are addressed in detail by Professor Robert Tavernor in his report. However, the relationship of the listed building to its new extension and the effect on its special interest is germane here. The goal of the design of the new rooftop structures has been to be as discrete as possible while providing a contemporary and

clearly defined new capping to the building. It has been designed to, particularly, be more discrete on its southeast facing elevation (towards the World Heritage Site) from which it would normally have very limited visual impact. On its other elevations, it is somewhat higher, but in these locations generally views of it would be restricted due to the nature of the narrow streets, indeed there really would be only longer views of it from the western side. The new extension along with the other alterations would otherwise result in the removal of the post-war rooftop plant room accretions which would be of benefit.

Other external alterations would all bring benefits to the setting of the listed building, with: the restoration of the windows at ground floor level at the north end of the west elevation and the east end of the north; the removal of the dock and loading bay to the west; and the restoration of the west area on the north elevation.

The removal of the original balustrade and lamp standards on the north elevation would mean they would have to be dismantled and reinstated upon re-building of the area wall.

5.3 Justification of the Proposals

5.3.1 The Proposed Use

PPG 15 reminds us (paragraph 3.8) that “*generally the best way of securing the upkeep of historic buildings and areas is to keep them in active use. For the great majority, this must mean economically viable uses if they are to survive...*” It adds that judging the best use is one of the “*most important and sensitive*” that have to be made and “*many listed buildings can sustain some degree of alteration or extension to accommodate continuing or new uses...*”

Ten Trinity Square was built in the early 20th century as a headquarters building for a public body. It enshrined in its design a corporate ethos which is reflected in its architecture externally, but also in particular elements of its internal layout and design. However, there are other parts of the building that area, in effect, early 20th century commercial architecture. The building is now redundant as a headquarters and, in commercial office terms, an anachronism. Therefore, a new use has to be found that will allow the most significant elements of the original design to be protected while providing the building in its entirety with long-term viability.

PPG 15 also sets out in paragraphs 3.13 and 3.15 what might be acceptable in terms of alterations or extensions “*to accommodate continuing or new uses*”. Here it states “*Indeed cumulative changes reflecting the history of use and ownership are themselves an aspect of the special interest of some buildings*”.

What PPG 15 stresses (back to paragraph 3.9) is that it is necessary for planning authorities to balance “*... the economic viability of possible uses against the effect of any changes they entail in the special architectural or historic interest of the building...*”.

Addressing such issues raised by the proposals:

This building has had later alterations that reduced its special interest. As a result of war time bombing, the building lost its central rotunda and also some of its high quality finishes. The post-war years saw a mediocre office block built in the courtyard replacing the Beaux Arts rotunda, and extensions at roof level, as well as reconstruction in the bomb damaged areas in the entrance hall, the southeast staircase and the wings. Later in the 20th century re-fitting of the offices saw a rather homogeneous approach taken to re-fitting the wings above the ground floor. Other particular changes resulted in the accretive degradation of the original building with rooftop plant rooms and a ground level loading bay compromising its setting. Nothing that has been done to the building since its original construction has enhanced its original design.

Ten Trinity Square is a redundant headquarters building which has suffered alterations in the post-war years that are all without any particular merit and, in some cases, detract from its special interest. That it is redundant is a real issue, as it no longer provides, even in its more prosaic commercial areas, the kind of accommodation that is required by companies in the City of London.

This is not to say that the building is in poor condition. In many ways its post-war employment has ensured its survival and the nature of its last use, in particular, allowed the really high quality rooms and spaces in the building to be used for the purpose they were designed and they have been beautifully preserved thanks to that. However this, perhaps, exemplifies what an opportunity now arises to provide this remarkable building with new viability and a use which could replace the post-war construction with new architecture that would reflect the original design of the building and, otherwise, make the most of what is truly its special interest.

Before addressing the question of what may be lost or gained in the proposals to convert and extend this building to allow hotel use, with some residential elements, a few comments about specific issues might be appropriate.

To satisfy the servicing requirements of such a new use would require both parking and loading facilities. However, the proposals rather cleverly address this by including in the design for the two pavilions in Seething Lane. This with the extension of the garden and removal of the service road and loading bay would enhance the setting of the building.

To ensure the viability of the proposals it would be necessary to provide additional accommodation in the courtyard and at roof level. From a structural point of view this can be achieved without affecting the structural layout and integrity of the original building. The extension would result in the removal of the post-war accretions at roof level and, in addition, provide an elegant design to the rooftop. While this would be visible in some views of the building, these would not be the critical ones and, most importantly, the views from the Tower of London World Heritage Site would not be materially affected.

Within the courtyard the extension would restore the ground floor layout of the original building design and would allow all of the original entrances to the building to re-connect to its central reception. The new rotunda would be high quality

architecture in its own right and, while replicating the nature of the original space, would provide a new architecture different to the original fabric, adding to the richness of the building experience. The floors above this within the courtyard would also reflect this contrast and, while to provide connections through to the original building would require re-modelling of the courtyard wall, this is plain original fabric which would, in the designs, maintain its integrity in material and detailing.

The opportunity brought by re-building in the courtyard would also allow a major new space to be developed below the new rotunda, providing a new ball room facility in the City of London.

The new use would allow, with minimal alteration, the suite of fine rooms on the second floor to be employed in appropriate ways with high quality uses. The alterations in the more interesting areas of the wings would ensure their interest, in terms of finishes and detail, would also be preserved. Where the wings are of less interest, these spaces would be exploited by sub-division into hotel suites.

In addition, the building would be re-serviced and the proposals would address such matters as DDA compliance and the needs for a more energy efficiency.

It has to be concluded that the proposed uses would not compromise the special interest of the building but would help ensure its long term viability.

5.3.2 Alterations

PPG 15 makes it clear in paragraph 3.5 that it is important when making any alterations to listed buildings to identify: the importance of the building; the features of the building that justify its inclusion on the list; its setting and contribution to the local scene; and the extent to which the proposals bring substantial benefits for the community including the enhancement of its environment. Addressing these criteria first. The elements of the buildings that would be demolished are not those parts that would contribute its 'intrinsic architectural or historic interest'. While the extensions would affect the building's setting and the local scene, they would be appropriate, of high quality and would not materially affect any key views. The proposals would ensure the long-term viability of this key City of London building and its most significant historic interiors and setting. The restoration of the building's plan form and re-opening of its entrances, along with the alterations in Seething Lane and to the garden would bring community benefits and, in particular, a better relationship with the conservation area.

Referring back to PPG 15 in paragraph 3.13 it states "*many listed buildings can sustain some degree of sensitive alteration or extension to accommodate continuing or new uses*" and 3.15 "*achieving a proper balance between the special interest of a listed building and proposals for alterations or extensions is demanding...; but it is rarely impossible if reasonable flexibility and imagination are shown by all parties involved.*"

The balance here is on the one side the alterations proposed to change the fabric, and on the other the viability which would fall out of such proposals.

In general terms, the proposals would result in the following changes:

- Re-modelling of fabric which is mainly either original but of limited significance, or is inter- or post-war, or is modern, or previously altered;
- Extend the building on the roof but set back from the street elevations;
- Insert a new building into the courtyard which would result in the loss of some original fabric but the restoration of the original ground floor plan form;
- Build new pavilions to the rear of the building to allow servicing and extend the Seething Lane Garden by removing the existing service road and loading bay.

The proposed alterations would however, result in the following benefits:

Securing the long-term viability of the building;
Repairing the external and internal fabric securing the future of the most significant elements of the building's special interest;
Respect for and restoration of the original plan form and layout of the building;
Provision of uses for the most significant spaces that will secure their long-term viability;
Provision of uses for the other high quality spaces that will secure their long-term viability;
Enhancement of the setting of the building, with public realm improvements.

5.3.3 Summary Justification

Overall, the proposals would not compromise the special interest of the building or its setting, but would provide viability for the historic fabric. The benefits of the proposals could be summarised thus:

- The provision of a long-term viable use for the building.
- The conservation, repair and/or restoration of the significant original fabric in the building.
- The restoration of the plan form of the ground floor with a new central rotunda linking to all of the original entrances.
- The re-creation of the garden to the east with the creation of two contemporary pavilions.

What might be seen as controversial aspects of the proposals are:

- The rooftop extension. However, the design would not materially affect the most significant views from the Tower of London World Heritage Site and, otherwise, would be set back and provide a well-designed terminus to the building and the current clutter of service enclosures would be removed.

- Extensions in the courtyard. However, the courtyard was never the most significant fabric in the original designs and its materials, plan form and detail would be respected in the proposals.

The proposal to convert the building to hotel use is a 'good fit' solution to providing a new use for this important historic building. The balance of issues set out above explains that the proposals would bring major benefits to the listed building greatly outweighing any perceived disbenefits.