

Barker-Mills Conservation

Heritage Statement

4 Sandwich Street London

Author: Dr N P Barker-Mills BA(Hons) PhD Dip Cons (AA) IHBC FSA

Version: NPBM 23/30 FINAL

Date: 28 /02/2024

Contents

1.0	Introduction and purpose of report.....	page 3
2.0	Advice on Significance	page 4
3.0	The work carried out.....	page 6
4.0	The requirement for Listed Building Consent.....	page 8
5.0	Conclusion	Page 9

Appendices:

Appendix NPBM 1 National Heritage List Entry (NHLE)

Appendix NPBM 2: Qualifications and Experience

Appendix NPBM: Documents and Sources used to inform the Statement

1.0 Introduction and purpose of report

- 1.1 Barker-Mills Conservation is an independent, expert consultancy advising on the historic environment. Nigel Barker-Mills, the author of this report, trained as an architectural historian and has an honours degree and doctorate awarded by the University of Reading. Following appointment as a Fieldworker for the Accelerated Resurvey of the Lists of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest for the county of Surrey, he was employed by Surrey County Council as a specialist historic environment officer advising on all aspects of the management of historic buildings and areas. He founded and subsequently chaired the Surrey Conservation Officers' Group and commissioned the first Buildings at Risk survey for the county. During his time in Surrey, he obtained a Post Graduate Diploma in Building Conservation from the Architectural Association of London, which included preparing a thesis on the issues around education of construction professionals working on historic buildings.
- 1.2 In 2000 he joined the south-east region of English Heritage in the role of Historic Areas Adviser during which time he advised on new development and regeneration issues across Kent, Surrey, Sussex and Oxfordshire. He provided expert monitoring for the Heritage Lottery Fund on area grant schemes and was the national lead for English Heritage in Developing the "Building in Context Toolkit". This training programme, delivered by the national network of Architecture Centres in collaboration with the Commission on Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE), won a national planning award in 2008.
- 1.3 In 2009 Nigel joined the London Region of English Heritage (later Historic England) as Head of Partnerships and subsequently Head of Development Management, with responsibility for strategic relationships with the Greater London Authority and managing the London Historic Environment Record. In 2011-2 he was appointed Planning Director for the London Region, leading a team of 40 specialist Inspectors and advisers, including architects, planners and surveyors providing the statutory advice and grant assistance across the capital. He retired from Historic England in 2016.
- 1.4 Nigel is a full, founder, member of the Institute of Historic Building Conservation (IHBC) and has served on both the south-east branch, as Chairman and Secretary, and also the national committee. He was Chairman of the Editorial Board of "Context" the Journal of the IHBC for 6 years to which he has contributed several articles. In 2014 he was elected as a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London. In 2017 he was appointed Chair of the Heritage Advisory Group of the Canals and Rivers Trust. He was appointed to a second term in 2021.

- 1.5 Nigel has been a member of several expert design panels, including those in Oxford and the London Borough of Haringey and has also published on architectural history and conservation. In 2015 he presented a paper at the 43rd Oxford Joint Planning Law Conference, an annual event organised by the Law Society, the Bar Council, the RTPI and the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors (RICS). The paper on “Heritage Assets and their Setting” has been published in the Journal of Planning and Environment Law: Occasional Papers No 43 (*pub Sweet & Maxwell*)
- 1.6 Barker-Mills Conservation has worked with clients across both public and private sectors including the Greater London Authority; The Corporation of the City of London; London Borough of Southwark; Guildford Borough Council; Hart District Council; Waverley Borough Council and Historic England in both the south-east and the north-west. Private sector clients include the Gascoyne Cecil Estate and JCB and recently Nigel prepared the draft Historic England Guidance on the Conservation of Georgian and Victorian Terraced Housing issued in July 2020.
- 1.7 This Statement has been commissioned by the Council of Lutheran Churches and its purpose is consider whether works recently undertaken at 4 Sandwich Street affect the special interest of the building as a designated heritage asset and therefore, whether they should be the subject of an application for Listed Building Consent.
- 1.8 The judgements and views of the author in this Statement are provided in accordance with the Code of Practice of his professional Institute; the Institute of Historic Building Conservation (*IHBC*).

2.0 Advice on Significance

Background

- 2.1 The property is currently owned by the Council of Lutheran Churches but is in the process of being sold. An issue has arisen with regard to recent (2022) works carried out to the roof and parapets of the property and whether the work required Listed Building Consent from the local Planning Authority, in this case the London Borough of Camden.

The building and its' heritage significance

- 2.2 The National Heritage List for England (NHLE) entry relating to number 4 Sandwich Street is provided in *Appendix NBM 1*. The building is part of an entry that relates to a wider terrace of buildings, Numbers 2-9 (consec.) and includes the ancillary railings to the front of the properties. The terrace was first listed in 1974 and the list description has remained unamended since that date. Number 4 is specifically mentioned because it has rendered upper floors over its rusticated stucco ground

floor, instead of the brick which characterises the other houses in the terrace. The list entry is a description of the front elevation of the terrace and whilst it mentions the existence of parapets it does not specify the material or forms of the roofs. The interiors are similarly not described.

- 2.3 It should be noted that in their guidance with regard to the analysis of significance Historic England state:

Designation records for the heritage asset (bear in mind that list descriptions and HER entries are intended to identify the asset only, not to describe significance)

Therefore, whilst the NHLE and relevant Historic Environment Records will provide information as to why any building may have been selected for designation, which is based on the criteria of Age and Rarity for listing, an assessment of significance based on the heritage interests is still required when considering works.

- 2.4 Significance is one of the guiding principles running through the historic environment section of the National Planning Policy Framework (as amended 2023). The NPPF defines significance as ‘the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest’. Such interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic’ and it may derive ‘not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting’.¹ Significance is what conservation sustains, and where appropriate enhances, in managing change to heritage assets.
- 2.5 The list entry dates the terrace to the early 19th Century which means it falls under the following category when considering listing:

- *from 1700 to 1850, most buildings that retain a significant proportion of their original fabric are likely to be regarded of special interest, though some selection is necessary; (DDCMS Revised Principles for Selection p 6 paragraph 18)*

The building is also identified as possessing Group Value and the explanation provided is:

- **Group value:**
The extent to which the exterior of the building contributes to the architectural or historic interest of any group of buildings of which it forms part, generally known as group value. The Secretary of State will take this into account particularly where buildings comprise an important architectural or historic unity or a fine example of planning (e.g. squares, terraces or model villages) or where there is a historical functional relationship between the buildings. Sometimes group value will be achieved through a co-location of diverse buildings of different types and dates. (DDCMS Revised Principles for selection p 6 paragraph 17)

- 2.6 Historic England provide Listing Selection Guides to set out a broad historical framework for each building type and what issues are considered when buildings are selected for listing. Numbers 2-9 fall within Domestic 2: Town Houses (2nd Edn. published 2017). In the summary of why these types of buildings are significant Historic England state:

Squares, circuses, crescents, terraces and planned streets form high-points in the history of English urbanism. Continental visitors have long admired the novelty and subtlety of the Georgian terrace as England's great contribution to the urban form, and the planning interest of urban domestic developments can be very considerable.

In London, Bath and Brighton whole districts of terraces exist that have defined our perception of these cities, yet examples are distributed across the country: from Liverpool and Plymouth; to towns in rural Lincolnshire; and in resort towns like Sidmouth (Devon) and Tunbridge Wells (Kent).

- 2.7 The guidance goes on to describe Late Georgian terraces in the following manner:

The London Building Acts were more strictly enforced after 1774. Later eighteenth-century terraces are generally more austere; their windows longer and glazing bars thinner; grey or stock brick superseded red; and projecting bands of brickwork were eliminated. What is lost in the detailing may be made up for in the syncopation of repetition, and in the emergence of finely detailed decorative ironwork and carved or moulded stonework, rusticated ground floors, Coade stone decoration, or stucco dressings applied to brickwork, which lent an extra level of interest to the later Georgian town house. (page 8 paragraph 1.6)

- 2.8 A very simple summary of the heritage significance of Number 4 would therefore be as follows:

“Number 4 Sandwich Street is of high architectural interest as one element of a formal terrace composition dating from the early 19th Century. The architectural expression of the terrace relies for its effect upon classical precedents, consistency and the use of a simple palette of materials. There is a simple architectural hierarchy to the front elevation which is the principal external elevation and the roofs are deliberately visually suppressed behind parapets. The decoration comprising rustication and decorative ironwork adds interest. Internally the plan forms would also have originally been consistent although could have been adapted to suit particular owners. The terrace is of high historic interest in illustrating a distinctively English urban type that was built on a speculative system that illustrated and reflected the emerging different social classes in society. “

3.0 The work carried out

- 3.1 The work carried out to the property was identified as part of a defect survey undertaken in 2021 by Hallas & Co Chartered Surveyors. The report was based upon visual inspection and was non-invasive. It was commissioned because of a crack

that had appeared in the fabric at ground floor level. The listed status of the building was identified in the report. The roof structure was inspected and the roof covering was identified at that time as comprising “modern fibre cement slates” with mortar bedded ridge tiles. The roof covering material for the small area of flat roof to the rear of the property was not identified.

- 3.2 The report identified the typical construction of buildings of this period and also demonstrated a good understanding of the common issues affecting them. The conclusions were well informed and no significant structural issues were identified. The report included reference to water ingress into the upper storey and noted that this was in the process of being addressed. The report concluded with a strong recommendation that the necessary repairs to the roof of the front of the building should be carried out to prevent further water ingress and risk to the timbers. (Page 9 Section 5 Bullet 2) Other minor works were identified and recommendations for simple actions using traditional materials were suggested.
- 3.3 A specification and tender for the repairs to the roof, parapets, gutters and upstands was submitted by Maguire Brothers (March 2022). Within that tender it was confirmed that the existing pitched roof coverings were fibre cement (possibly containing asbestos) and that the ridge tiles were cement. The flat roof was recorded as being a worn mineral felt that had reached the end of its life. The proposed repairs included the replacement of the roof coverings with ventilation for the roof, improvements to the roof hatch and reconfiguration of the gutters to conform to the required modern standards. All of the works were straightforward for competent professionals and none involved significant intervention into historic fabric.
- 3.4 The proposed replacement of the mineral felt to the flat roof was a modern equivalent system and in general term was a “like for like” replacement. The specification for the pitched roof offered two options. The first was another modern fibre cement type slate, the latter was natural, Spanish, slate. The natural Spanish slate was selected by the client.
- 3.5 In a letter of May 25, the contractors identified that the parapet (upstand) of the roof had, on closer inspection found to be friable and not capable of repair. It was therefore proposed to rebuild on a like for like basis in order to allow for the lead flashing and soakers required for the new roof. Attention was also drawn to the condition of the chimney, which had been very poorly pointed as can be seen in the pictures accompanying the letter. These images illustrate the existing fibre cement slates and the concrete ridge tiles. The upstand was duly rebuilt, but the stack was not in the ownership of the property.
- 3.6 A further contractor’s report of 22 July from Maguire brothers to the client contains images of the works in progress. From these images it is possible to see the new roof covering largely in place with the verges adjacent to the upstand almost complete. The lead soakers are in place but the final flashing has yet to be installed. The report also includes images of the gutters being installed including the substrate and then the final lead finish. The standard of the work looks acceptable.

4.0 The Requirement for Listed Building Consent

- 4.1 An application for listed building consent is required, in general terms, for all works of demolition, alteration or extension to a listed building that affect its character as a building of special architectural or historic interest. The requirement applies to all types of works and to all parts of those buildings covered by the listing protection (including objects or structures fixed to the listed building, and to objects or structures within the curtilage, such as outbuildings), provided the works affect the character of the building as a building of special interest. (*Emphasis added*)
- 4.2 The special interest of 4 Sandwich Street is set out above (Paragraph 2.8). The works undertaken have not affected the plan form of the building and the role it plays within the wider terrace. The special historic interest of the building has not been affected by the works. Works to roof coverings have the potential to affect architectural interest as existing materials can contribute to architectural character. In this case the existing roof covering was modern, comprising fibre cement slates with concrete ridge tiles with a mineral felt on the rear flat roof. The existing roof covering probably dated from the time of the conversion of the building in 2008, although it may have existed previously.
- 4.3 The traditional or characteristic material used on roof for buildings of this period and in this location would have been slate. Because the roof was not meant to be seen in order to preserve the architectural impact of the front façade, roofs would usually be very low pitched, and where they covered a deep plan form, they could take the form of “butterfly” or “M” pitches to ensure they were not visually prominent. Slate was the favoured material as it performed well on roofs with lower pitches, whereas other materials usually employed in this period, including clay tile often failed after a short period because of lamination caused by the low pitch.
- 4.4 In this case it is almost certain that the original roof covering for number 4 Sandwich Street was natural slate. The works carried out have not increased the visual prominence of the roof and have substituted a cement fibre slate with a natural slate with a riven surface, albeit of Spanish origin.
- 4.5 Historic England has produced guidance on when works to a listed building require express consent in *Making Changes to Heritage Assets: Historic England Advice Note 2 published 2015*. In Section 1: Repair it is stated:
- “With the exception of repairs to scheduled monuments, which will almost always need consent, minor repairs are unlikely to require planning permission or listed building consent (where relevant) if the works are carried out using the same materials and techniques and they do not affect the significance of the asset... and... It is good practice for owners/applicants to seek their own advice; the local planning authority can advise.”*
- 4.6 In further details the Advice states:
- Original materials normally only need to be replaced when they have failed in their structural purpose. Repairing by re-using materials to match the original in substance, texture, quality and colour, helps maintain authenticity, ensures the repair is technically and visually compatible, minimises the use of new resources and reduces waste. However,*

alternative approaches may be appropriate if it can be demonstrated that the technique will not cause long-term damage to the asset and results in less overall loss of original fabric and significance or demonstrates other major benefits.

- 4.7 The works to the rear flat roof and the lead gutters have used materials that matched the existing in terms of texture, quality and colour. The works are visually compatible, there has been no loss of original (that is historic) fabric and the new roofs have been carried out to modern standards regarding ventilation and disposal of water. These are benefits to the building as they improve its performance and reduce the risk of water ingress, condensation or further decay. The rebuilding of the upstand to accommodate the flashing for the roof has used like for like materials and techniques. They are therefore both visually and technically compatible with the building.
- 4.8 The replacement of the pitched roof covering has not been on a like-for-like basis because a modern inappropriate fibre cement roof covering has been replaced with a natural slate, with a riven surface. This replacement is more compatible in terms of texture, quality and colour to what would almost certainly have been the original, or historic, material and therefore sustains the authenticity of the building and has been undertaken with proper regard for the integrity of the asset which is an important objective identified in paragraph 13, page 3 of the Advice.
- 4.7 The replacement of one material by another may require listed building consent but only when the work affects the character of the building as a building of special interest. In this case it is understood that the London Borough of Camden is of the view that the works require LBC.

5.0 Conclusion

- 5.1 The works carried out on 4 Sandwich Street are essentially repairs to correct identified failings in the existing building. Those failures were putting the building at risk primarily by allow water penetration of the fabric below the roof.
- 5.2 The repairs to the flat roof and the lead gutters were carried out on a like for like basis but to meet modern standard of performance. With regular maintenance in the future, including regular checking and clearing the gutters, they should perform well.
- 5.3 The work to the pitched roof included the replacement of inappropriate fibre cement slates with an alternative natural slate. The replacement has not resulted in a change to the significance of the heritage asset, that is a change to the historic or architectural interests of the building which justify its designation as a listed building. The works have sustained the integrity of the building and by including appropriate provision for ventilation they have similarly reduced risks to its existing historic fabric.

Appendix NPBM I: NHLE entry

Official list entry

Heritage Category: **Listed Building**

Grade: **II**

List Entry Number: **1245856**

Date first listed: **14-May-1974**

List Entry Name: **NUMBERS 2-9 AND ATTACHED RAILINGS**

Statutory Address 1: **NUMBERS 2-9 AND ATTACHED RAILINGS, 2-9, SANDWICH STREET**

Location

Statutory Address: **NUMBERS 2-9 AND ATTACHED RAILINGS, 2-9, SANDWICH STREET**

The building or site itself may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.

County: **Greater London Authority**

District: **Camden (London Borough)**

Parish: **Non Civil Parish**

National Grid Reference: **TQ 30136 82549**

Details

CAMDEN

TQ3082NW SANDWICH STREET 798-1/90/1425 (East side) 14/05/74 Nos.2-9 (Consecutive) and attached railings

GV II

Terrace of 8 houses. c1813-1824. Yellow stock brick with some later patching and refacing. No.4 stuccoed. Rusticated stucco ground floors; Nos 2 & 9 lightly scored as ashlar, No.3 plain. Stucco 1st floor bands. 4 storeys and basements. 2 windows each. Round-arched doorways with pilaster-jambs (mostly reeded) carrying cornice-heads; patterned or radial fanlights (except Nos 2-4) and

panelled doors. Gauged brick flat arches to recessed sashes; 1st floor (except No.3) with cast-iron balconies. Parapets. Nos 2 & 4, decorated cast-iron rainwater heads. INTERIOR: not inspected. SUBSIDIARY FEATURES: attached cast-iron railings with urn finials to areas. (Survey of London: 24: London: -1952: 88).

Listing NGR: TQ3014482538

Legacy

The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.

Legacy System number: **477960**

Legacy System: **LBS**

Sources

Books and journals

'Survey of London' in Survey of London - Kings Cross neighbourhood The Parish of St Pancras Part 4: Volume 24, (1951), 88

Legal

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Appendix NPBM 2: Qualifications and Experience

Education/Professional Qualifications

1976-1979 BA honours Degree (2:1) in History of Art and Architecture Reading University

1978 Courtauld Institute Scholarship to attend the Summer School in Venice and the Veneto led by (then) Sir Anthony Blunt. 1979-1982 Awarded a State Scholarship to carry out research for a Doctoral Thesis on “*The Architecture of the English Board of Ordnance 1660-1750*” supervised by Prof Kerry Downes

1990 Post Graduate Diploma in Building Conservation awarded by the Architectural Association- dissertation subject – *The Repair of Traditional buildings- a Question of Education?* - which examined the level of skills and knowledge available to contractors and owners of historic buildings in the SE of England.

1997 Elected, founding, Member of Institute of Historic Building Conservation (Membership Number 0004)

2014 Elected Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London

Professional Career

1982-1986 Fieldworker for the Accelerated Resurvey of Lists of Buildings of special Architectural or Historic Interest – responsible for Surrey

1987-2000 Employed as Historic Buildings Adviser Surrey County Council providing specialist advice on the conservation and repair of historic buildings, areas and landscapes in Surrey. Key achievements include establishing Conservation Officers Group for Surrey (Chairman for 11 Years), establishing and publishing the first Buildings at Risk register for the County in collaboration with the 11 local planning authorities, providing expert witness advice for several major public inquiries including Wotton House – restoration of Grade II* country house and Grade I Registered Landscape, and one of the first successful prosecutions of an owner for unauthorised works to a listed building in the county. Providing training for the Surrey Planning Officers Society and Building Control officers on the management of historic buildings and providing expert advice for the Surrey Historic Buildings Trust Repairs Grant Scheme.

2000-1 Historic Buildings Adviser for Waverley Borough Council

2001-2009 Historic Areas Adviser/Team Leader in English Heritage SE Region with responsibility for new development in historic areas and area grant schemes across Kent, E and W Sussex, Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire. Key achievements include establishment of community-based conservation area appraisal projects in Surrey which became a national exemplar; community-based characterisation projects in Oxford working with the Oxford Preservation Trust and developing a model conservation area appraisal and management plan strategy in collaboration with Aylesbury Vale DC. During this time, I was identified as the EH National lead on Building in Context – developing and publishing the

BiC Toolkit in partnership with CABE and the Kent Architecture Centre and rolling the training programme out across the country. The Toolkit received a Planning Award from the RTPI in 2007/8. Other key achievements included supporting the development of Townscape Heritage Projects in Rochester and Hastings, monitoring HLF grant projects and commissioning a conservation plan for RAF Upper Heyford which led to its designation as a conservation area— subsequently successfully appearing as an expert witness to oppose the local council’s proposals to demolish nationally significant Cold War Structures and securing new uses for the former aircraft hangers. Supporting the regeneration of former railway workshops at Wolverton and the repair and regeneration of Bletchley Park with the Bletchley Park Trust

2009-2011 English Heritage London –Head of Partnerships – taking the lead on Heritage at Risk for London and strategic partnerships with the Greater London Authority and the London Boroughs.

2012-2016- Planning Director for the London office (team of 44) responsible for the provision of specialist advice and grants, maintenance of the Historic Environment Record for London and the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service. In 2010 appointed Historic Environment representative on the London Mayor’s Cultural Strategy Group.

2016-to date- Established *Barker-Mills Conservation* specialist expert (heritage) consultancy with clients in the public and private sectors including Gascoyne Cecil Estates, Historic England NW and SE offices; Greater London Authority; Ryde School; Horsham District Council and various private developers.

Other roles

1984-2000 Member, and for part of the time Secretary, of the Surrey Archaeological Society Buildings Committee

Elected Honorary member of the Arts and Crafts Movement Surrey- Chairman (2016-2018)

1987-2000- Trustee of the Watts Chapel – involved in the successful campaign to repair the roof of the internationally significant Grade I listed Funerary Chapel in Compton, Surrey

Registered lecturer with the Department for Continuing Education Surrey University

Registered lecturer with Workers Education Association, NADFAS (now the Arts Society) and U3A – teaching courses on architectural history and conservation

1997- 2009 Chairman, Vice Chair and Treasurer of the SE Branch of IHBC at various times, serving continuously on the Committee from

2000-2006 Editor and then Chairman of the Editorial Board for *Context* the journal of the IHBC and serving on Council from

2010-2016 Member of the New London Architecture Sounding Board

Member of Oxford West End Design Review Panel

Expert Assessor for Hackney Design Awards 2013 & 2014

2017 Appointed Chairman of the Heritage Advisory Committee of the Canals and Rivers Trust – re appointed 2021

2017 Member of the Advisory Board for Glasgow University- School of Urban Studies research project on “*Why Does the Past Matter? Emotional attachments to the Historic Environment*”

Publications

Contributed to “English Architecture Public and Private: Essays for Kerry Downes Ed Bold & Chaney

Contributed to “Nature and Tradition: Arts and Crafts Houses and Gardens in and Around Guildford” published GBC 1993

English Heritage Informed Conservation Series: Margate 2008 with Allan Brodie etc

Articles in *Context* including a review of the conservation legislation in first Decade of the 21st Century

Paper on: *Setting of Heritage Assets- A Practitioner’s View for the Joint Planning Law conference Oxford 2015 (published proceeding Sweet& Maxwell).*

Historic England 2020 Conserving Georgian and Victorian terraced housing. Swindon. Historic England.

Appendix NPBM 3: Documents and sources Used to Inform this Advice

National Heritage List for England

Revised Principles of Selection for Listed Buildings DDCMS November 2018

Historic England:

Listing Selection Guides: Domestic 2: Town Houses 2017

Historic England Advice Note 12: Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets 2019

Historic England Advice Note 2: Making changes to Heritage Assets

Contract Documents

Defect Inspection Report by Hallas & Co Reference: 3645 - RC-R: 30 JULY 2021

Specification and Tender Proposal from Maguire Brothers. March 2022 Revision.

Letter from Maguire Brothers, 25 May 2022

Maguire Brothers Contractor's report No. 2 July 2022