

Insufficient attention is given to conservation issues. The property is both opposite Jeffreys Conservation Area and near Grade II listed properties on Kentish Town Road and Hawley Road. Camden's policies state that conservation issues are to be considered when adjacent to conservation areas.

While there have been various back extensions for some properties of this row of shops (for example for kitchens or storage), extensions to these properties have been insufficiently considered for their conservation context.

South Kentish Town CAAC has made an assessment of the properties adjacent, proposing (2015) widening the boundaries to include both sides of Kentish Town Road.

In the Laurie map of 1841, Moreton Terrace is shown on the west side of Kentish Town Road opposite Jeffreys Terrace, and villas south from Hawley Road to the Fleet.



In the (Rumsey) map of 1843, there are two full rows along the west side of Kentish Town Road, with Hawley Road and Clarence Road marked out.

The *Survey of London* in 1938, for 'Kentish Town Road and Highgate Road, west side', notes that "A certain number of the early houses remain, e.g. Nos. 65 to 95, 101 to 107, and 119 to 131".

Nos. 65 - 91 (Moreton Terrace) were built in the 1830s, along Kentish Town Road before the larger development of Lord Southampton's land in the 1840s. Some of the row retain some of their original features (for example front corbels, roofs, chimneys). The shops are close to the road, with small front areas (originally York stone slab), no railings or front grills, and a generous pavement in front balancing the longer gardens opposite. Nevertheless, both sides of the road could benefit with visual improvement.

No 65, known in 1854 as the Moreton Arms, is wider than other buildings in the terrace, slightly higher, and built a decade later, it forms a strong corner to the row, with a wooden shop facade and retaining pediments to the first floor windows (these follow round into Hawley Road).

Nos 67-73 form a balanced row. Some retain windows in original design, both at the front and rear, and parapets without cornices hide low roofs. The fronts are brick painted, some in colour in an Irish fashion. The small front areas are mainly concreted, although no. 71 has original York stone. There are neither basements nor railings.



The rear views of the houses are visible from Hawley Road. The pub has a single-storey extension on its side flank. Some are white painted and with valley roofs. There are some added ground floor back extensions, and various quantities of ventilation and electrical equipment on walls. An elegant red- brick wall has been built in 2015, and a rather surprising vine with grapes in season, grows from one of the gardens, overhanging the service road from a tree.



Objections

1. The concept of putting a two-storey living-space extension onto the existing early nineteenth century London terrace garden is unacceptable. The current rear elevation has the traditional character, of windows and brickwork, with views of the chimney from the garden. Elsewhere in Camden, there has been side infill to a back extension, to create a larger living / dining room for the main house. Putting a separate two-storey house 'in the back garden' because it is 'underused space' is unacceptable for conservation of this sensitive row of Georgian houses.

2. Georgian building Grade III and Grade IV house / shop basements of this period were only designed for use as storage, or by cattle. They were not for living quarters, have neither ventilation nor windows and very low ceilings. Such a basement cannot simply be designated as 'shop'. No shop in this row uses the basement for direct retail purposes.

3. The proposed extension would take more than 50% of the existing green space / back garden, contrary to Camden's policies for extensions (a 'green roof' is not an acceptable substitute)

That the back garden is not currently used is no reason for not retaining it - future upstairs residents with children would be able to use it more effectively than the current occupiers. It looks west and currently provides a green lung among the poorer developments either side.

The plans show a tree existing in both the property back garden and the adjacent back garden. A full tree survey is required.

4. The property stands near the Fleet river (although the original course is unclear). All BIAs of nearby developments have all shown that the land is not simply 'London clay' but has a layer of sand / gravel between made earth and the full clay. This is probably the 'valley' from the Fleet:



Twyman site, Camden Road (2011):

P 108: In some locations above the London Clay there are aquifers that flow through gravels and brick-earths that lie above the Clay strata. The construction could have an effect on the flow... Site investigation by Geoprobe Environmental in November 2011

Castle pub / 147 Kentish Town Road BIA (2015)

s Ltd.		Site 147 KENTISH TOWN ROAD, LONDON, NW1 8PD	Borehole Number BH2
Ground Level (mOD)		Client RINGLEY LIMITED	Job Number 1320693
Date 28/04/2013		Engineer RWA LONDON	Sheet 1/2
Level (mOD)	Depth (m) (Thickness)	Description	Legend
	(0,10)	MADE GROUND : Concrete surface.	Water
	0.10	MADE GROUND : Brick and concrete rubble	
	(0,10)	MADE GROUND : Very soft black silty clay with ashes and brick fragments.	
	0.20		
	(1,10)		
	1.30	Dense brown very sandy sub angular fine to coarse very clayey flint GRAVEL. Sand is fine to coarse.	
	(1,10)		
	2.40	Stiff becoming very stiff brown and mottled orange brown, veined blue grey silty CLAY with occasional partings of light brown silty fine sand and occasional small gypsum crystals	

152-156 Kentish Town Road (2015)

5.2 London Clay Formation

The London Clay initially comprised a layer of naturally reworked firm brown and dark grey mottled silty very sandy very gravelly clay with partings of dark orange-brown sand and occasional roots and extended to a depth of 3.30 m in Borehole Nos 2 and 3.

Below the initial reworked soils, the London Clay comprised firm becoming stiff fissured dark brown and grey mottled slightly silty slightly sandy clay with orange-brown clayey silty sand partings, decayed rootlets at 7.0 m depth, fine to coarse selenite crystals, occasional shells and pale grey silty clay partings and was encountered to the full depth of the shallow boreholes, of 7.00 m and to 8.20 m in Borehole No 1.

Below this, the London Clay comprised grey clay to the full depth investigated, of 15.00 m.

5.3 Groundwater

Groundwater was encountered within the London Clay at depths of 6.10 m and 5.50 m in Borehole Nos 2 and 3 during drilling respectively. Three groundwater monitoring standpipes were installed and groundwater has subsequently been monitored prior to the installation of a standpipe in Borehole No1, within Borehole Nos 2 and 3 on a single occasion, approximately two weeks after installation, during which groundwater was measured at depths of 1.81 m and 1.37 m in Borehole Nos 2 and 3 respectively.

79 Camden Road BIA (2013):

2.3.3 A review of the borehole logs has confirmed the presence of London Clay. London Clay deposits were overlain by what appear to be natural superficial deposits (material assessed by the survey as Head), generally represented by brown silty clay with some sandy pockets and gravel.

5.3.8 During a recent geotechnical survey (AP Geotechnic 2013) several boreholes were recovered from the northern half of the application site,

5. The proposal BIA has indicated concerns that there would be significant 'heave' from excavation and this could have substantial effects on adjacent properties.

The stability of the adjacent buildings which currently hem in the proposed site can simply be underpinned if trial pit investigative works show the new basement and semi basement are to be taken lower than the adjacent building's foundations. Providing these works are undertaken by competent contractors the proposed basement works do not pose undue risks to the neighbouring properties.

Placing a large concrete block (the extension) in a corner where there are existing buildings is technically difficult, may need piling or deeper excavation than indicated. These problems have been downplayed by the applicant, and need independent review.

6. The London Underground Northern Line runs in Kentish Town Road, and gives no demonstration of their approval.

7. The Design statement does not adequately address design-for-living access.

8. Insufficient attention has been given to the façade, including windows, doors, plasterwork and improvements to the shop including access.

9. There should be consideration this property is in Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum, and how the revised shop would contribute to the local economy.