

2015/6736/P- Objection

This property is a two storey 'village-style' shop with storage basement within a row of five properties forming a non-designated heritage asset.

Separately raising the height would harm the historic design and roofline, and the proposed alterations are not sympathetic to its local listing status.

History

The five houses Nos 119-127 Kentish Town Road are among the oldest buildings still remaining in south Kentish Town, reflecting the village origin before the side-road terraces and estates were erected in the nineteenth century.

James King, in his Panorama, describes, in the early 1800s "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 seen in an un-numbered photo in Gillian Tindall's *The Fields Beneath*, adjacent to the eighteenth-century building 'hiding behind a fish bar' (see p 105). They are also similar to the 'pre-Victorian village-style shops' at in north Kentish Town – 316-326 Kentish Town Road – shown in the final plate (relating to p 183), which have kept now their two-storey level.

Architectural character

The full row of Nos 119-125 is a two-storey terrace, unchanged from their original design as housing / shops almost 200 years ago. While the Inspector has given an opinion at appeal APP/X5210/W/15/3011894appl that would allow an additional storey for No 127, in relation to Nos 129 and No 131 (which may be of similar age, but with greater additional works). But the Inspector recognised the need for 'balance' of two and three-storey buildings:

The proposal [for No 127] would result in the matching terrace of five being reduced to four with the three-storey section being increased to three; however the character of the extended building would reflect that of its neighbours on each side and I consider that when seen from the front or rear the balance between two- and three-storey buildings would not be upset.

Moreover, at present no scheme has been approved since the Appeal, nor started or competed for No 127, so it is impossible to state how a scheme for No 127 would relate. The Appeal statement says:

I agree with the Council that within the terrace (Nos 119 to 131) an individual roof extension could detract from its heritage and townscape value. ... Any further proposals to extend the two-storey buildings would be considered on their own merits.

Design

The design does not conform to Camden's heritage requirements.

- The application states the proposed materials would be 'white painted masonry', but the front is currently original brick (it is No 123 which has been painted, but this is contrary also to the recommendation for old brick buildings).
- Timber windows are welcomely proposed but these should be specified sash and fitted on first floor level.
- 'Slates to match existing' should be 'slates to match original' – ie Welsh slates from the period, rather than replacement of any existing composite tiles.
- No attention is given to the brick chimneys which are an important existing aspect of the building and give visual height.
- There is no indication that the flat 'felt roof' of the extension meets energy-saving requirements.

It would be welcome to have general improvement works to the existing building, including

- the front commercial sign should be reduced in size,
- the first floor windows should be replaced with wooden bi-paned sashes and stone sills.

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.