

Gillian Tindall

27 Leighton Road
London NW5 2QG



Patrick Marfleet
Planning and Development
Town Hall
Judd Street WC1H 9JE

17 August 2016

Dear Patrick Marfleet,

PA 2016/4487/P 29 Leighton Road NW5

It has been brought to my attention that the above house, which adjoins ours, is currently the subject of an extensive Planning application. I have examined the plans. Essentially the application comprises two parts. One part is an application to erect a single storey ground floor/rear infill extension. Some comparable modifications have been done to other houses along this terrace in the past (including our own) and I would think that what is planned here would mainly be of personal concern to the occupants of adjoining houses, so I do not propose to comment on them here. I would, however, point out that this is only house in the terrace of six to have retained, so far, its original back configuration.

The purpose of this letter is, rather, to alert your department concerning the other part of the PA, which consists of a request to build an entire extra loft-storey onto the main structure of the house. This is a totally unacceptable proposal in Conservation and historic terms.

No.29 is one of six houses in a late Georgian terrace (1828) which is one of the oldest structures in Kentish Town. The whole terrace (and the houses, some of them Listed, facing it across the street) form the original nucleus of the first Conservation Area in the district. This was delineated – in consultation with me, as I am an urban historian – in 1985 and has since been considerably enlarged. Our own house, No.27, is Listed, Grade 2, by English Heritage [now Historic England]. So is the house at the other end of the terrace, No.37. The whole immediate area, both sides of the road, is regarded by English Heritage as being 'of special interest.'

The terrace presents an homogeneous appearance, with appropriate windows and the original lights over the front doors intact. None of the houses was built with dormer windows above the parapets, and none have been added. To destroy the unity of such a rare surviving run of houses with one additional floor sticking up like a broken tooth should be unthinkable – indeed I am rather surprised the PA has got to this formal stage without someone pointing this out to the applicant.

It is, incidentally, within my knowledge that when a (far more modest scheme) for upward back extension was put forward several years ago by the owner of no.35 it was definitively turned down.

I would appreciate a response from you or one of your colleagues;

Yours sincerely,



Gillian Tindall FRSL