

2015/6736/P- Objection

The raised height would harm to the historic design and roofline of this property within its row of small two-storey shops.

History

The five houses Nos 119-127 Kentish Town Road date from the Georgian early nineteenth century, as Providence Row at the 'entrance' to Kentish Town. They are among the oldest buildings left in Kentish Town, reflecting its village origins before the side-road terraces were erected.

James King, in his Panorama, which recalls views of from the early 1800s (although the commentary is from around 1850), notes: "Providence Place, known as the entrance to the village, where stood six wooden Cottages, since pulled down and replaced with Brick fronts. The vacant frontage is now filled by small Shops, continuing to ... a Splendid Gin Palace erected in lieu of the Old Castle Tavern".



1803



1843

The buildings can be discerned in the 1803 map from the British Museum and are entitled Providence Place in the 1843 map.

Nos 125 and 127 Kentish Town Road are included in the (un-numbered) photo in Gillian Tindall's *'The Fields Beneath'*, adjacent to the eighteenth-century building 'hiding behind a fish bar' relating to on p 105, and similar 'pre-Victorian village-style shops' are also shown in the final plate relating to p 183.

Design

At present, the adjacent buildings Nos 121 and 125 are two-storey. Adding a third storey building, in the middle of an existing two-storey roofscape, is contrary to

Camden's policies on roof extensions and would result in serious harm to the appearance of the row of buildings (Nos 119-125).

In the appeal judgement at No 127 Kentish Town Road, the Inspector agreed with the Council that within the terrace (Nos 119 to 131) an individual roof extension could detract from its heritage and townscape value. The Inspector reported that because No 127 was "immediately adjacent to a building of similar appearance and heritage ... it would not detract from the character or historic value of the terrace". However, "Any further proposals to extend the two-storey buildings would be considered on their own merits."

The design does not conform to Camden's heritage requirements – the front commercial sign should be reduced in size, the existing-level windows should be replaced with wooden bi-paned sashes, and be recessed with stone sills. Moreover, the original building row was stock brick and slates, while the proposal would increase, rather than reduce, the current inappropriate render, paint and artificial composite roof tiles.

Information

The application is missing information required by Camden for its planning applications:

- Rear extensions: plans should show the boundary walls with the adjoining properties and, where relevant, the relative levels of adjoining properties... [and] ...an elevation from the neighbouring perspective.



- Window replacement: provide existing and proposed sections showing relationship of window frame to reveal
- Lifetime homes statement
- As the site is locally listed, a justification of the proposal in accordance with the criteria in paragraph HE9 of Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5) – Planning for the Historic Environment
- Statement on car-free housing.