

## **19 CHALCOT CRESCENT NW1 8YE**

### **Design and Access Statement and Historical Impact Study**



FRONT ELEVATION

SIDE AND REAR ELEVATION

The application property is a single family dwelling and was listed in 1974. The listing description reads as follows

TQ2783NE CHALCOT CRESCENT 798-1/74/183 (West side) 14/05/74 Nos.19-27 AND 19A (Odd) and attached railings

GV II

Terrace of 5 houses. 1860-8. Probably built by J Burden. Yellow stock brick with rusticated stucco ground floors. 3 storeys and basements. 2 windows each. No.19A, 1 window on return; Nos 19-27, 3 windows with recessed entrance bay. Stucco doorcases with pilasters supporting entablature; doorways with pilaster-jambs carrying cornice-heads, fanlights and panelled doors. Recessed sashes with margin glazing; ground floors with cast-iron window guards, upper floors architraved, 1st floors with console bracketed cornices. Stucco cornice and blocking course. INTERIORS: not inspected. SUBSIDIARY FEATURES: attached cast-iron railings with spearhead finials to areas.

## **PROPOSAL**

The proposal is to refurbish the property internally , the details of which are covered in the historic impact study below.

In addition a rear conservatory is proposed which would require planning consent.

The new conservatory has been designed so that it is invisible from the street. The existing rear garden is a storey lower than pavement level and the presence of a high wall to the back of pavement means that the ridge of the conservatory is below the level of the garden wall to the pavement.

## **DESIGN**

The proposed design of the conservatory is to be as transparent as possible so that the original outline of the listed building is clearly defined. The existing finishes to the listed building externally would be retained, with new openings at basement level to help bring additional light into the interior of the basement.



EXAMPLE OF THE TYPE OF FRAMELESS GLASS CONSERVATORY PROPOSED

## **HISTORIC IMPACT STUDY**

A pre application meeting was held on the 14<sup>th</sup> August with Camden's senior planning and conservation officer Antonia Powell.

A number of observations were made on the initial sketch proposals submitted, and these comments have been incorporated into the proposed application design.

To avoid repetition we have included the historic impact study justification in red alongside the comments received.

-----  
e-mail received 16<sup>th</sup> August 2012 (our comments in red)  
RE: Pre Application Meeting 19 Chalcot Crescent Ref 6012

*Dear Mr Down*

*Thank you for your message and I am sorry to have missed you on the telephone. Thank you also for taking the time to show me around No. 19 Chalcot Crescent earlier this week.*

*The property, as you know is Grade II listed. The interior has undergone late 20th century refurbishment and I am of the opinion that the plaster ceiling roses we discussed on the first floor are likely to be recent installations. Ceiling roses as decorative as this would not normally be found in back rooms to the upper floors. Much of the staircase joinery, including the hand rail and banisters has been replaced although it looks to me as if the actual stairs are original. The quality of the replacement joinery is good. A number of the doors and architraves to the upper floors may also have been replaced.*

*As we discussed I have had an opportunity to review the floor plan and consider the existing historic details and my comments on the proposals are as follows:*

### ***Top floor***

*I note that some changes to the original floor plan of rear rooms are likely to have taken place sometime during the later part of the twentieth century. With this in mind the inclusion of a modest shower room between the front and rear bedrooms may be possible. I do not remember seeing fire surrounds to these rooms but this will need confirming and my comments may be revised in light of additional information.*

*The cornicing to the stair well ceiling looks to be original and the historic proportions of the top landing are retained. As such I consider alterations to the floor plan to be detrimental to the spatial quality of the top landing and with the associated loss of historic fabric this part of the proposal would be unlikely to have my support.*



Our proposals have been amended to leave the staircase and walls to bedroom 4 at this level intact. The existing door to bedroom 2 has been moved, but the original door and architrave will be reused. A small shower room has been included to bedroom 2, but the main spine wall between the bedrooms has now been left in place.

### **First floor**

*The historic introduction of a bathroom to the back room has involved a substantial amount of additional joinery which appears to date from the late 20th century. The chimney breast is subsumed within the modern joinery and although the historic ceiling cornice is retained in situ the original layout of the room is somewhat compromised.*

*The proposed dressing rooms will not, in my opinion, cause further harm in listed building terms, to the spatial quality of the room. Services and pipes etc have already been introduced and providing the existing runs are reused wherever possible to avoid any additional harm to the fabric I have no objections to this part of the proposals. The proposed basin within a recess to the smaller bathroom however is considered to be detrimental to the general layout and with the loss of a section of the original partition wall, is unlikely to have my support.*

The layout of the bathroom and dressing room was supported as it was believed the cornicing and ceiling rose was not original and the rear room had been compromised by a lot of additional joinery. In terms of the basin in the alcove to the landing bathroom, we would confirm that the original wall layout and covings etc will stay in place and this should be considered as no more than an opening in the wall, no larger than a door frame to gain access to the basin located behind the wall. It is hoped that in this context this alteration would be considered acceptable, especially in the light of the difficulty in fitting a basin in this bathroom.

### **Upper ground floor**

No change

### **Lower Ground floor**

*This part of the scheme is the most involved and has the potential to cause the greatest harm to the special interest of this listed building. I consider the rear elevation to be of importance as it retains its original openings and very little alteration to the original brickwork. Internally the stair case also appears to be original and the internal walls follow what looks to be the original layout of the basement. As we discussed the joinery of the windows, is I consider, original with fine box shutters and slender glazing bar sections. All these elements I believe, contribute to the historic significance of the building.*

*The proposed covering in of the side garden area is unlikely to effect the special character or appearance of the building and in principal I have no objections to this element of the proposals.*

*The removal of a substantial amount of the external walls to create large openings is, in my opinion, the most contentious element of the scheme. The loss of the historic openings, historic joinery and brickwork will, I consider, cause substantial harm to the appearance and character of the building and is unlikely to have my support. There maybe scope however to create an opening to the side wall beyond the base of the staircase leading to the proposed covered conservatory area.*

*The removal of internal walls to the extent shown is also unlikely to have my support. As we discussed I would expect a clear indication of the historic layout to be retained in the form of masonry nibs and down stands.*

*The extent of retained historic joinery will need to be confirmed before I am able to advise you on the proposed changes to the stair case. If the joinery dates from the 20th century refurbishment then the reconfiguration maybe acceptable. If the joinery is found to be historic then I would expect the stair to remain unaltered.*

*The proposed lowering of the garden level and changes to the utility space and w.c. will not impact on the historic interest and as such there is no objection.*

The proposals have been revised to leave a larger proportion of internal walls with substantial nibs left in place, and downstand beams denoting the original wall pattern.

The existing window with box shutters looking onto the garden from the new kitchen has been retained in its entirety as this was thought to be important to preserve. Also the existing rear door has been retained, although this is thought to be of less worth from the standpoint of preserving historic joinery.

One window has been removed to allow for an opening into a new conservatory. Also a new opening has been created to the side of the house at basement level.

The new conservatory was not thought to be controversial in this location, and it does allow additional light into dark basement , and create wider openings onto the garden without compromising the historic fabric of the building. As described above the conservatory would be made from frameless glass as far as possible to create the most transparent addition possible in order to allow the fabric of the listed building to be clearly delineated.

The existing staircase from ground to basement has been much altered in the past. The original 1860's balustrade rail is evident from first to second floor, but the other two floors have had the balustrades changed for newel posts and decorative baluster posts. It is believed that the original flight of stairs from ground to basement may have been a straight flight of steps, and the proposed changes would re create this and also improve the layout at ground and basement level. At ground floor level the front door leads directly onto a balustrade rail which is not comfortable as you would expect the flight of steps to lead directly down to the basement.

The justification for changing the stair arrangement at basement level is to create a glazed fire lobby from the kitchen to the rest of the house which does not exist at present, but which is a requirement of building control to protect the occupants of the house in case of a fire starting in the kitchen and spreading to the rest of the house.



ORIGINAL EXPOSED STRING AND CONTINUOUS HANDRAIL AT FIRST FL

STAIR AT BASEMENT HAS HAD A CLOSED STRING AND NEWEL POST AND NEW BALUSTER POSTS ADDED

*I am on leave as from today but hope these comments are helpful. I am aware that your clients may find this report disappointing in parts however I will happy to discuss revisions when I am back in the office and hope then to achieve a scheme which will then have my support.*

*Please note these are the informal views of an officer of the council and would not prejudice any subsequent decision taken by the council.*

*Antonia Powell  
Senior Planner (Conservation) Development Management Team (West Area)  
Regeneration and Planning  
Culture and Environment  
London Borough of Camden*

Telephone: 020 7974 2648  
Web: [camden.gov.uk](http://camden.gov.uk)

In addition to the points raised above a very positive contribution to the historic setting is proposed by replacing the existing modern glass conservatory in the front lightwell to the property, with an amended design to include painted back door, sash window, white painted render and leaded roof.



FRONT CONSERVATORY STRUCTURE WHICH IS  
VISIBLE FROM THE STREET TO BE REPLACED

## ACCESS

Level access to the garden would be a positive contribution of these proposals. Otherwise access within the building would not be effected.