

REVISION C  
FULL-PLANNING DESIGN STATEMENT

FOR

A FOURTH-FLOOR MANSARD ROOF EXTENSION

AT

NO.103 KINGS CROSS ROAD,  
LONDON WC1X 9LP

BY

WILLINGALE ASSOCIATES  
56 CLERKENWELL ROAD  
LONDON EC1M 5PX

OCTOBER 2023

# CONTENTS

- 1 Introduction**
- 2 Site and Context**
- 3 Proposed Refurbishment and Extension**
- 4 Planning Policy Context**
- 5 Design and Access Statement**

## **1 Introduction**

- 1.1 This Design and Access Statement has been prepared by Willingale Associates, architects, in support of the full- planning application Revision C proposals, submitted on behalf of the freeholder of No.103 Kings Cross Road, London WC1X 9LP for a fourth-floor mansard roof extension.

## **2.0 Site and Context**

- 2.1 The application site of 77 sq.m is located on the street corner on the west side of Kings Cross Road and south side of Frederick Street in the London Borough of Camden. The site is occupied by a terraced 19thC building of traditional load-bearing brick and suspended timber construction rising on five levels (B,G,1,2,3) to a flat roof behind brick parapets, with commercial premises on ground and basement floors entered on the corner and three self-contained apartments on 1<sup>st</sup>,2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors entered by a separate door on Frederick Street.
- 2.2 No.101 Kings Cross Road to the south and the two-storey premises of King Cross Eyes at No.101B along with No.103 on the corner share the same 19thC architectural rhetoric and were apparently built as a group.
- 2.3 The site falls within the Calthorpe Street/Frederick Street Sub Area 14 of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area and the neighbouring listed houses of Frederick Street by Thomas and William Cubitt are briefly described in clause 5.252 on pp101 in the section relating to Frederick/Ampton Street.
- 2.4 On the map of the Bloomsbury CA Sub Area 14 Townscape Appraisal the 19thC group at Nos. 101,101B and 103 Kings Cross Road along with the

modern building at No.97-99 Kings Cross Road are identified as an area of “Positive Building” that contributes to the character of the conservation area.

- 2.5 The four neighbouring terraced houses at Nos.1-7(odd) Frederick Street are grade 2 listed (List Entry Number 1322167) built c1835-39 by William Cubitt. No.1 adjoins No.103 Kings Cross Road.
- 2.6 A map chronicle with associated information outlines the history and development of the site and context: -

1746 The approximate location of the site is indicated on John Rocque’s map beside the River Fleet, a road and a field boundary. From here to the south the River Fleet diverges from the road named Black Mary’s Hole, a forerunner of the Kings Cross Road, to leave an area of gardens between the road and the river that become Bagnigge Wells a pleasure garden with a chalybeate well. A stone once above an entrance to this garden can be found in the front elevation of No.63 Kings Cross Road on the west side some 100m south of the application site. At this time the Fleet was still fresh and liable to occasional flooding.

1813 The William Faden edition of the Horwood Plan indicates the site where the River Fleet diverges from the roadside to run behind Eldon Buildings, an example of the ribbon development that had begun to advance north along the road. Part of the Bagnigge Wells pleasure ground is seen further south this now giving its name to the road.

By 1813 Thomas and William Cubitt were already beginning to lay out the development of Frederick Street, for which the north boundary along the rear gardens between Frederick and Acton Streets is shown on the map. Opposite Ampton Place formerly Frederick Place, Thomas Cubitt develops from 1815-21, immediately following the Napoleonic Wars concluded by Waterloo, the three fine houses at Nos.48-52, the first in Frederick Street. From 1823-27 Thomas then develops the houses of Frederick Street from the Grays Inn Road to Frederick Place and is followed from 1827-32 by his brother William who develops the houses east of Frederick Place to Cubitt Street formerly Arthur Street

1834 John Brotton’s Map shows Frederick Street developed by Thomas and William Cubitt from Grays Inn Road to Arthur Street while still leaving undeveloped the final stretch to the Fleet and Bagnigge Wells Road. The Fleet, running across the application site and now less salubrious, is still open south of Frederick

Street. Nos.1-7 Frederick Street east of Cubitt Street to the application site are constructed by William Cubitt c1835-39. How William dealt with the Fleet and completed his terrace is unclear from the maps but may be described in the Survey of London Vol.XXIV, Kings Cross neighbourhood, Parish of St. Pancras IV, London 1952.; input from the BCAAC on this would be welcome. The party wall and chimneystack of a former William Cubitt house survives on the west boundary of the application site indicating there was at least one more house in the terraced group; see below.

1871

The ordnance survey map extract shows the terraced housing of Frederick Street now including the truncated William Cubitt terrace c1835-39 that adjoins the application site on the corner of Bagnigge Wells Road, by now upgraded to become the Kings Cross Road. The map shows the site of No.103 straddling one of the Metropolitan Railway tunnels constructed c1861-63. Whatever occupied the corner to terminate William's terrace prior to the 1860's had been cleared to make way for the railway and thereafter the site for No.103 was prepared for redevelopment above the tunnel.

The map indicates the 4No.adjoning William Cubitt houses in Frederick Street, and the two storey (B,G) dwelling on the corner of Cubitt Street, formerly Arthur Street. The William Cubitt houses form a handed arrangement in which Nos.1 and 3 share a single, longer chimney stack with reflected house plans each side. Further along Frederick Street at Nos. 9-27 on the south side also built by William we find similar double chimney stacks at the centre of the semi-detached pairs each end and within the central four-house group with attic storeys, where the end houses have hipped roofs like the one at No.7 on the east corner to Cubitt Street, though here there is no attic storey.

The shading to the rear elevation and end wall of the terraced houses indicates that the site of No.103 and associated sites of Nos. 101B and 101 forming the similar group were still undeveloped in 1871 following construction of the railway. The matching architectural composition and detailing of Nos.101, 101B and 103 indicate they were subsequently constructed by the same builder/developer and their unusual plan form is presumably the result of forming a culvert for the River Fleet at a depth that clears the railway tunnel while still passing beneath the basement of No.101B. This was a complex construction project for the mid 19thC and one that in part explains why the map shows these sites as still awaiting redevelopment. There was the need to allow time for the backfill above the cut-and-cover tunnels

to settle before the new road layout could be completed. Building leases needed to be issued and negotiated by the Metropolitan Railway before redevelopment on the new sites could begin. The Overend, Gurney & Company banking crash of May 1866 followed by the economic depression and harsh winter of 1867 may have contributed to the delays so that more than a decade passes from construction of the tunnels to redevelopment of the group on the corner of Kings Cross Road including No.103. British History Online, though not including No.103 as a building of note on Kings Cross Road, describes other developments constructed in 1874 over the tunnels on leases from the railway. There is a note too that some of the houses built over the tunnels suffered from subsidence.

The delay is accompanied by a significant change of architectural taste, away from the uniform stuccoed Cubitt terraces to the pragmatic brickwork of later 19thC commercial development. No obligation was felt to continue the form of the terraced houses around the corner, the redevelopment instead opting for a taller composition to include an additional storey for the flats above commercial premises, resulting in the current variegated functions and appearance of Frederick Street at the turn into Kings Cross Road.

The Cubitt's progress east along Frederick Street witnessed the gathering gloom as the Metropolitan Improvements optimism of the 1820's following the Napoleonic Wars made way for the Great Wen pessimism of the 1870's, with the railways penetrating the metropolis through the rookeries and sloughs of despond. Kings Cross Road by the Metropolitan Board of works became a busy thoroughfare but had none of the Metropolitan Improvements optimism of Cubitt's terraces half a century earlier: compare Nos.48-52 Frederick Street with No.103 Kings Cross Road.

1894

The ordnance survey map extract now shows the completed development of the group at Nos. 101-103 on Kings Cross Road along with the same adjoining composition of terraced houses on Frederick Street. Elsewhere comparison of the 1871 and 1894 maps illustrates how the sites cleared for construction of the railway had in the 1870s been redeveloped with a consistent grain of terraced housing plots.

A preliminary search of Post Office Directories suggests the redevelopment of the corner site was complete and occupied by 1875 and may have first provided commercial premises for a bookbinder. The unusual full-height stuccoed cartouches for signage may therefore have been for advertising the book-binding

business though this requires further research, a matter where again input from the BCAAC would be welcome.

As for the Cubitt terraces the architectural design and composition of the corner redevelopment was focused on completing the new thoroughfare for the Metropolitan Board of works not resolving the terraces of Frederick Street. The proportions and details of the corner redevelopment were unashamedly commercial with elevations not concerned with the form of the roof behind the parapets.

1914 Although showing some anomalies in Frederick Street it is assumed that this ordnance survey map extract shows the same general arrangement as for 1894 and today.

2022 Current ordnance survey extract still with an anomaly for No.1 Frederick Street where current photographs confirm that No.1 is a similar but lefthanded version of the terraced houses at Nos.3,5 and 7.

2.7 A set of existing site survey drawings and photographs is provided with the application. Existing brick parapets run around all elevations to front, sides and rear of No.103 at the same height above roof level. Four chimney stacks serving No.103 rise above this parapet; one on the corner, one above the Kings Cross Road elevation, one above No.101B to the south and one on the party wall to No.1 Frederick Street to the west. As a result of the handing of the adjoining houses at Nos.1 and 3 Frederick Street their chimney flues rise to form a single, larger chimneystack in the party wall between them so that the chimney flues in the west party wall of No.103 only serve accommodation within No.103. It is clear from the plan form and elevation of the chimney stack in the west wall of No.103 that it is the residual chimneystack of a former William Cubitt house on the site though now reduced in height and with only three chimney pots of the original nine, these retained to serve the three flats on the upper floors of No.103.

2.8 The terraced group of Cubitt houses on Frederick Street east of Cubitt Street, formerly Arthur Street therefore had at least one more house that was demolished by the railway works. From the symmetrical handed composition of houses further west on Frederick Street by William Cubitt he may have planned a symmetrical handed group of 6No.terraced houses, subject to resolving what to do with the open River Fleet and carriageway of Bagnigge Wells Road. The terraced frontage between Swinton and Acton Streets is slightly forward of that between Acton and Frederick Streets suggesting there may have once been sufficient space to consider 6No. houses before the development of Kings Cross Road. However along come proposals for the Metropolitan Railway following the Fleet subsequently truncating the terrace on Frederick Street, which may have ended asymmetrically with a hipped roof over a fifth house and

a side porch, like that on the west corner of Cubitt Street, taking up the remaining space on the corner of Bagnigge Wells Road.

A preliminary search of Post Office Directories has not been able to confirm the arrangement of the Cubitt terrace before arrival of the railway or the date when the corner site was subsequently redeveloped after 1871 though it appears to have been completed by 1875 becoming the commercial premises of a bookbinder. It is hoped that the BCAAC may have further information to help resolve these points on the site history and development of the site.

- 2.9 Nos.97-99 Kings Cross Road, identified as a “Positive Building” in the Bloomsbury CA Sub Area 14 and forming part of Nos.93-99, is a recent development with a mansard roof a storey higher than the adjoining No.101 and No.103 Kings Cross Road.
- 2.10 Railings have been erected around the parapet of No.101 Kings Cross Road.
- 2.11 There is an automatic opening vent (AOV) in the roof above the common parts stairwell for release of smoke in the event of a fire but no access to the roof from the common parts for the dwellings.
- 2.12 A selection of existing site photographs is provided with the application documentation. The current bright white paint of the former signage cartouches and shopfronts on the corner provides a harsh contrast to the polychromatic brickwork of the corner composition and the soft off-white tone of the Cubitt terraces.
- 2.13 In summary, there is an architectural and historical fault-line between No.1 Frederick Street and No.103 Kings Cross Road that with the residual damaged chimney stack of the former house has arguably never been properly resolved. Furthermore the architectural and historical significance of the corner group is less above the ground than below, with the planning, engineering and construction of the Fleet as a culverted sewer running above the railway tunnels yet below the basements of the subsequent redevelopment on the corner site and frontage of the Kings Cross Road being the main interest.

### **3.0 Revision C Proposal**

- 3.1 As before, the proposal removes the existing flat roof of felt finishes with shallow falls on firrings and forms a new fire-rated structural timber compartment floor incorporating the existing third floor ceiling joists.
- 3.2 The chimney stack of the west party wall is restored with 9No. chimney pots to match those of the grade 2 listed Cubitt houses at Nos. 5 and 7 Frederick Street.
- 3.2 A structural timber mansard roof enclosure with 70-degree pitch and shallow pitched roof is formed within the existing brick parapets and set back behind

the Frederick Street parapet so the mansard enclosure then rises beside the restored chimney stack and space is provided for a front terrace behind the parapet.

- 3.3 3No. dormer windows are provided, one narrower than before with French windows for access to the front terrace and two on the flank elevation facing Kings Cross Road leaving the roof enclosure to turn the corner with a small facet behind the chamfered corner with chimney pot. The roof and dormer windows are detailed in leadwork in accordance with the design guidelines and the roof finished with natural slates.
- 3.4 A new AOV is provided above the common parts stairwell and the rest of the stairwell is enclosed to form a stair rising to the new fourth floor accommodation where there is sufficient space to accommodate a (1b,1p) studio apartment of 37.6sq.m. for which a single bed is now shown though many people prefer a double-bed even if sleeping alone.
- 3.5 Revision C with fewer dormer windows set away from the corner provides a further reduction in volume from Revision B which was already a significant reduction in both volume and height from the proposals as originally submitted.
- 3.6 The former signage cartouches and shopfronts on the corner are to be painted a soft sandstone colour to complement the brickwork of the corner group and provide an appropriate contrast to the off-white stucco of the Cubitt terraces. A dark paint tone is applied above the door within the arched recess on the chamfered corner and within the arched recess on the Kings Cross Road frontage to express the proportions of these openings while rendering alarms and vents less obtrusive.

#### **4.0 Street perspectives of the proposed form and massing**

- 4.1 Where visible from the streets, the restored chimneystack in the west party wall resolves the setting and appreciation of the listed terrace of Cubitt houses by restoring missing components and providing a bookend that distinguishes their early 19thC Metropolitan Improvements composition from that of the later 19thC Metropolitan Railway and Metropolitan Board of Works commercial redevelopment half a century later on the corner
- 4.2 Just as the chimneystacks of the Cubitt houses from the middle distance may be seen rising above the parapets without affecting an appreciation of their architectural composition so the proposed form and massing of the fourth floor at No.103 set back behind the restored chimneystack may sometimes still be visible in the middle distance but has no adverse impact on the setting or appreciation of the early 19thC architectural composition of the Cubitt terraces.



- 4.3 Similarly, the proposed form and massing on the corner at No.103, where a more prominent form is appropriate, even when visible above the parapets from the middle distance has no effect on the ability to appreciate the architectural composition of the later 19thC Metropolitan Board of Works. The proposed form and massing is lower and less prominent than the recent mansard enclosure at Nos 97-99 Kings Cross Road, considered a positive building in the conservation area, and much less prominent than the railings around the parapet of No.101 Kings Cross Road.
- 4.4 From a location further south on Kings Cross Road looking north the proposed form and massing is barely visible beyond the existing parapet and again less prominent than the mansard at Nos.97-99 Kings Cross Road and the railings around the parapet at No.101 Kings Cross Road.
- 4.5 Elsewhere when viewing Frederick Street and the Kings Cross Road closer to the corner the proposed fourth floor will not be visible.

## **5.0 Public benefits in accordance with the NPPF**

- 5.1 The proposal resolves the architectural and historical fault line between No.1 Frederick Street and No.103 Kings Cross Road by restoring the full-height and form of the chimney stack that formed part of the listed Cubitt terrace, thereby enhancing the form, setting and views of the listed terrace while providing an appropriate book end for the terrace where previously truncated and redeveloped by the railway works. A listed heritage asset is restored and the character and appearance of the conservation area is enhanced.
- 5.2 The proposal replaces the current bright-white paintwork of the former signage cartouches and shopfronts with an appropriate, warmer tone for the fare-faced brickwork, Metropolitan Board of Works corner composition in contrast to the brighter, off-white tone of the Cubitt terraces.
- 5.3 The proposals make efficient use of an existing well-serviced metropolitan site to provide an additional dwelling during a housing crisis all in accordance with current infrastructure and planning policy while also providing an attractive new apartment with good aspects and private external amenity space
- 5.4 The proposal less than half a mile from Kings Cross provides an additional dwelling within and for the emerging and economically significant “Knowledge Quarter” of London, the biotech-computer sciences – information hub centred within one mile of Kings Cross. Accordingly, at No.103 Kings Cross Road the Bloomsbury Conservation Area can provide an attractive and convenient

dwelling comfortably within walking distance of the key centres in the Knowledge Quarter.

## **6.0 Comments with reference to the clauses of the Michael Burroughs Associates letter on behalf of the long leaseholders of Flats A, B and C**

- 1 The letter is commissioned by the owners of Flats A, B and C to object to the proposals. With respect to the professional firm commissioned for the task the design assertions in seeking to find objection are consequently rhetorical rather than objective.
- 2 Revision B was a significant reduction to the original proposal both in plan and in height. Revision C makes a further reduction. Without prejudice to our case that no harm arises we hope that comments may be metered accordingly rather than reiterated
- 3 Revision C for 37.6sq.m now shows a single bed, though many single-occupiers may prefer to sleep in a double-bed
- 4 The proposed single-pitch mansard complies with the design guides
- 5 The Victorians chose not to run the main cornice around the corner from the terraced housing but provided a taller composition with an additional storey. The sash windows are not as tall as those of the terraced houses and contribute to a composition of horizontal banded brickwork, beneath a heavy cornice and plain parapet. This composition like the Cubitt terraces is read below the plain parapet, above and beyond which the familiar urban silhouette of chimney stacks and chimney pots that do not form part of the elevation were not considered to be part of the ordered architectural composition. Included in the corner composition are two vertical former commercial signage cartouches that rise to the main cornice where the parapets are surmounted by chimneystacks. These advertised the function of the commercial premises on the ground floor. Again, as for the Cubitt terraces, what happened above and beyond these elevations was not important. Consequently it is possible to add a low-profile, fourth floor enclosure set back behind the parapets and chimney stacks that even when visible has no impact on the ability to appreciate the Victorian composition of the corner group.

The photograph provided with clause 5 is one from Google Earth, with blue car and helmeted cyclist. The viewpoint location is from a survey car in the middle of the north, eastbound lane of Frederick Street from a position approximately opposite the party wall between Nos.3 and 5 Frederick Street. We have prepared a view from the back-of-pavement

line beside the Frederick Street Garden on the north side of Frederick Street opposite the party wall between Nos.1 and 3. From our viewpoint more can be seen over the parapet of No.103 as we are further back from the building. Nevertheless as can be seen from our view very little indeed can be seen of the low-profile proposal. The same Google Earth viewpoint is used for the photograph of clause 16 this time looking north with a claim that the proposal "*will have an adverse effect because its roofline is exposed to local views from Frederick Street Garden opposite*" but there will be no roofline visible beyond that seen in our view.

- 6 The low third floor storeys on the corners of the Cubitt terraces are attic storeys above the main parapets and an established form for providing emphasis to conclude the ends of a terraced composition. The terraced composition of Nos.9-27 further west on Frederick Street was built earlier than Nos.1-7 by William and suggests the completed composition to the corner of Kings Cross Road would have had a plain parapet and hipped roof at the east end like that of No.7 at the west end facing Cubitt Street formerly Arthur Street and not attic storeys above the main cornice. The Victorian corner composition has a plain parapet, not an attic storey.
- 7 As noted above, as the architectural composition of the corner group was concerned with the elevations one can add a fourth floor enclosure set back behind the parapets and chimney stacks that even when visible has no impact on the ability to appreciate the Victorian composition of the corner group.
- 8 The rhythm of the roofscape already changes from the listed terrace to the later 19thC corner composition and the proposals barely affect this change in rhythm. There is no harm to the setting of the listed terrace on the contrary the proposal restores a component of the listed composition to improve the setting and views of the listed terrace while providing a clearer distinction of early and late 19thC development within the conservation area.
- 9 This comment is based on viewing the orthogonal projection of elevation drawings not the three-dimensional appreciation of the architectural form and massing. The roof and skylight windows of No.1 Frederick Street are simply not visible from street level. The Cubitts and their predecessors did not want the form of the roof to disturb the architectural composition of the elevations. Similarly the composition of the proposal set well back behind the parapets will not disturb the appreciation of the Victorian composition on the corner.
- 10 As noted above the proposal improves the setting, views and distinction of the listed terrace and appreciation of the corner composition within the conservation area.

- 11 The proposals comply with the Camden Planning Guidance Design January 2021 clause 5.13:-
- 12 **Good quality materials and details are used, and the visual prominence, scale and bulk would be appropriate having regard to the local context.** Good quality materials are proposed and the visual prominence, scale and bulk is appropriate having regard to the local context. The fact that in some views the low-profile extension will be visible does not mean it will harm the appreciate of the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 13 **There is an established form of roof addition or alteration to a group of similar buildings and where continuing the pattern of development would be a positive design solution, e.g, helping to reunite a group of buildings or townscape.** This clause relates to situations where there is an established form of roof addition or alterations such as a terrace where some houses do and others do not have mansard roof extensions and is consequently not applicable
- 14 **Alterations are architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building and retain the overall integrity of the roof form.** The current roof form of the corner building is hidden behind the parapets. The proposed alteration is architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building. Had the Victorians provided a roof enclosure behind the parapets on similar lines no question would be raised today
- 15 The proposals comply with the Camden Planning Guidance Design January 2021 clause 5.14:-
- 16 **Buildings which have a roofline that is exposed to important London wide and local views from public spaces.** There are no important London wide or local views that will be disturbed by the proposal. The proposal is barely visible from the Frederick Street Garden as seen in our street views
- 17 **Buildings whose roof construction or form are unsuitable for roof additions.** The existing roof form is suitable for an extension. The structural implications of the modest increase in loads on the foundations above the tunnel will be considered for Part A of the building regulations and are anticipated to fall within acceptable tolerances especially as floor loading requirements have been reduced since the time the building was constructed.

The moot point here is whether an additional roof storey behind the parapets had been considered by the Victorians but postponed owing to limitations imposed at the time by the settlement of material above the

cut-and-cover tunnels. There was a need to sign the leases and get on with the works to recover the cost of the cut-and-cover railway construction and layout of the new thoroughfare. The lower form and massing of the Cubitt terraces would not have inhibited the Victorians from adding a roof storey to their commercial redevelopment on Kings Cross Road if time allowed. The irony here is that if the Victorians had completed the corner with a roof storey there would be protests should anyone propose to remove it today.

- 18 **Buildings designed as a complete composition where its architectural style would be undermined by any addition at roof level.** The tradition of 19thC elevation compositions is such that a low-profile roof extension behind the existing parapets has no impact on the appreciation of the 19thC composition
- 19 **The impact on adjoining properties both in terms of bulk and design and amenity of neighbours would be detrimental, e.g, due to a loss of light from the additional height.** The proposals do not impact on adjoining properties and the construction will meet the requirements of the building regulations for sound attenuation between the existing and new flat.
- 20 **Buildings that are part of a group where differing heights add visual interest and where a roof extension would detract from this variety of form.** The corner building forms part of a group on Kings Cross Road where neighbouring development has already been raised a storey higher with a mansard form that is part of a “positive building” in the conservation area and metal railings have been erected above the parapet so that the proposals will not detract from the appreciation of this group or the listed terrace. The proposal restores the chimneystack on the west party wall thereby enhancing the listed terrace
- 21 **Where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by additional extensions/storeys.** The scale and proportions of the existing building on the corner will not be overwhelmed by the low-profile proposal behind parapets as seen from the street views. The restored chimney stack improves and provides a suitable bookend for the listed terrace
- 22 The proposal does not have a staircase leading to the mansard roof.

## **Conclusion**

23-25 We refer to clauses 5.1 to 5.3 above that describe the benefits to the listed terrace and the character and appearance of the group on the corner within the conservation area along with providing an attractive new dwelling in a well-serviced area of the metropolis in accordance with national infrastructure and planning policy during a housing shortage. Accordingly the Council is respectfully requested to review Revision C and approve this modest proposal..

## **7.0 Other Comments**

7.1 We hope that by responding to the rhetorical and misleading statements of the Michael Burroughs Associates letter we have also addressed the concerns raised by the neighbour at No.1 Frederick Street, where the house will directly benefit from the restoration of the adjoining chimney stack and chimney pots.

7.2 Similarly we hope to have responded to the concerns initially raised by Catherine Bond the Principal Conservation Officer on the original submission and have demonstrated how the revised proposal restores a heritage asset and enhances the character and appearance of the conservation area by:-

- completing a composition left unresolved in the 19thC
- restoring a component of the listed William Cubitt terrace
- reducing the proposed enclosure on the corner
- relocating the roof terrace behind the existing parapet with a lower-profile than before
- providing a lower profile than the mansard at No.97-99 Kings Cross Road that is identified as a positive building within the conservation area.

With the result that there is no impact on the ability to appreciate and distinguish the early 19thC elevations of the Frederick Street terraces or the Metropolitan Railway and Metropolitan Board of Works group on the corner of Kings Cross, where the main interest is below rather than above ground, while providing an attractive new dwelling in accordance with national and local policy, during a housing shortage and within walking distance of the emerging Knowledge Quarter.

7.3 This review of the site history and context would welcome input from the BCAAC to help resolve the form that concluded William Cubitt's short terrace to the corner on Bagnigge Wells Road (one more house with a plain parapet and low hipped roof like that of No.7, perhaps with a porch to the side occupying the remaining space on the corner like No.9?), whether William's development had been the first to culvert the Fleet at this point (to culvert what was fast becoming an open sewer and whether the culvert redirected the Fleet to accommodate the terrace?), when the corner group redevelopment resulting in the existing building at No.103 was completed ( a preliminary review of maps

and Post Office Directories indicates after 1871 and before 1875 so quite a long delay after the demolition of Cubitt's work) and the occupier of the commercial premises that made first use of the two full-height signage cartouches on the elevations (perhaps a bookbinder).