

Heritage Statement

47 Albert Street, Camden

INTRODUCTION

1. This Heritage Statement has been prepared by Heritage Collective on behalf of the Client, Mr Neil Morgan, owner of No. 47 Albert Street, NW1 7LX (henceforth referred to as 'the Site').
2. The Site forms part of a group of grade II listed properties at Nos 45-97 Albert Street. It is located within LB Camden, within the Camden Town Conservation. The terrace is comprised of 4/5 storey dwellings dating to c.1845 and was designated grade II in May 1974. The list description has been included here for reference:

"Irregular terrace of 27 houses. 1845. Surveyor George Bassett Jnr. Yellow stock brick and rusticated stucco ground floors. Nos 77, 87, 93 & 95, slate mansard roofs with attic dormers to all save No.97. Nos 63, 75 & 83 with penthouses. Nos 93 & 95 projecting. 3 storeys and basements. 2 windows each. Square-headed doorways, some with pilaster-jambes carrying cornice-heads; fanlights and panelled doors. Nos 93, 95 and 97 with stucco doorcases of pilasters supporting entablature. Recessed sashes; Nos 45-61, 65, 67, 73, 77 & 79 with margin glazing to ground floor. Nos 81-97, tripartite ground floor sashes; Nos 93, 95 and 97 with consoles on mullions. Upper floors with architraved sashes; 1st floors have console-bracketed cornices and cast-iron balconies. Stucco cornice and blocking course except No.53 having a brick parapet. INTERIORS: not inspected. SUBSIDIARY FEATURES: attached cast-iron railings flanking entrance steps and geometrical railings to areas. Nos 93, 95 and 97, attached cast-iron railings with foliated finials to areas. The whole of Albert Street forms a cohesive group of the 1840s. No.97 Albert Street was listed on 14/01/94.

3. It is worth picking up on a number of general points within this list description:

- i. No.47 does not specifically get a mention in its own right, which suggests that it does not stand-out as particularly notable within the terrace, but rather contributes to the group overall;
- ii. The properties from No.73 through to No.97 are mentioned more specifically than Nos 45-67. Based on the descriptions within the listing entry, and from observations made on Site, these properties include a slightly greater level of external detailing; and,
- iii. The list description specifically references the irregularity between the group.

Background to the Application

4. The proposals have been informed by advice provided by Heritage Collective and through the pre-application process. Feedback from initial pre-application discussions with LB Camden informed a second pre-application submission, where the revised proposals were considered an improvement overall by officers. Feedback from LB Camden from the second pre-application phase has been summarised below. The areas below in **bold** are covered within this Statement in more detail in relation to the final Application:

- Officers note that their preferred approach is for basement developments not to extend beyond the footprint of the original building. However, they were of the view that, in this instance, the proposal was likely to be considered acceptable in planning terms due to the limited extents;
- The volume and fabric of the vaults are recognised as part of the significance of the listed building, but in this case, the extent of excavation proposed was considered limited and existing tanking obscures the historic form of two sections of the three vaults;
- **Although apparent at No.45, roof lights were not considered to be part of the established street character and not suitable for the location;**
- The proposed enlarged casement window would not be visible in public or private views and considered likely to be accepted by the Council;

- Relocation and extension of the rear courtyard by 1.8 meters was considered likely to be acceptable subject to detail;
- The Council would not object to the demolition and erection of a replacement 2-storey closet wing as the existing rear projection is not historic. Officers note that the historic pattern of closet wings has been lost within this terrace. The location of the existing closet wing was considered to be in a 'typical' location. The pre-application proposal was considered likely to be acceptable **if a design solution could be found that makes the historic arrangement appreciable alongside recent extensions with minimal loss to historic fabric and dilution of historic form**;
- The height of the proposed new extension and the increased overall footprint associated within the pre-application submission were considered to risk '**overwhelming the host building and obscuring the special interest of its plan form and rear elevation**'. However, the first (taller) proposals submitted were considered to be more 'elegant'. The officers noted that **the used of modern brick 'could' help the extension to rear as a new addition**;
- Concerns were raised over the loss of historic fabric at basement level. **Notably the removal of the sash window, dropping the sill and widening of the adjacent opening, which was considered 'unnecessary'**. The scale of the extension and size of the hard surface of the terrace above '**threaten appreciation of the historic scale and quality of the rear of the house**'.
- Overall the proposed design was considered of high quality and sympathetic. The inclusion of a green roof was welcomed;
- Doubts were raised over the quality of the lower-ground floor accommodation and the **impact of the extension and rearrangement at lower-ground floor on the special interest of the listed building 'by substantial alteration to the historic footprint and dilution of the basic plan-form'**. Revisions to the size and layout would help address these concerns;

- A third floor roof extension was proposed at pre-application stage. The Council note that the building retains a butterfly roof. The replacement of the roof with a mansard was considered 'unacceptable in principle and would result in the loss of significant historic fabric as well as the loss of one of the few remaining original roof forms in the listed terraces on Albert Street...'
- Restoration of the existing timber sash windows was recommended and double glazed units would not normally be acceptable in historic window openings;
- **The existing railings** at the front of the property should be repaired not replaced as they are likely to be original;
- Generally internal alterations proposed at pre-application stage were considered acceptable.

Purpose of this Statement

5. Proposals are subject to planning permission and listed building consent and this Statement has been prepared to accompany those applications.
6. Desk-based research has been undertaken along with a visit to Site, undertaken by the author of this Statement in February 2016, where observations were made of the quality of the building, level of alteration, level of survival and existing planform and internal hierarchy. Plans from the 1960s and 1980s have also been obtained by the Client and have been referred to within this Statement and included within the Appendices.
7. The Site currently consists of two demises with a 1-bed lower-ground floor flat, accessible from the front lightwell and the main 3-bed townhouse from ground-2nd floor. Although the building retains a good level of external survival, and is in reasonable condition, the interior tells a different story and is in a poor condition with limited surviving historic features with various alterations from various phases apparent.
8. The lower-ground floor flat does not comply with current building regulations and is in need of upgrading.

9. A summary of the planning history for the building, from 1980 onwards, has been provided within the Design and Access Statement (DAS) prepared by Inside Out Architecture, submitted as part of the Application. Works from the 1980s involved the conversion of the basement into a self-contained 1-bedroom flat and the associated alterations.
10. In addition, archival research (initially undertaken by the Client and included here at Appendix 2) has revealed that the building, as a whole, was considerably altered in the 1960s and included the removal of fireplaces and the removal and relocation of partition walls. Client wishes to refurbish and extend both properties, whilst retaining and reinstating historic features and detailing appropriate for the building, to reintroduce a sense of the building's original character and internal hierarchy.

Key Considerations

11. The following have been considered in the preparation of this Statement:
 - i. The significance of No.47 and its contribution to the special interest of the terrace as a whole;
 - ii. The character and appearance of the conservation area, and the contribution of the grade II listed terrace (including the Site) to the overall significance of the area;
 - iii. The extent of pre-application proposals;
 - iv. The impact of pre-application proposals on heritage significance;
 - v. Local and national planning policy and guidance.

Relevant Planning Policy Framework

12. The following have been taken into considerations:
 - The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990;
 - National Planning Policy Framework, 2012
 - National Planning Policy Guidance, 2014;

- LB Camden Core Strategy 2010-2025: Policy CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving the borough’s heritage.
- LB Camden Development Policies: Policy DP24 – Securing High Quality design; and, DP25 Conserving Camden’s Heritage.
- LB Camden Local Plan: LB Camden are currently consulting on their Local Plan (Submission Draft 2016), which runs until 4 April 2016. Chapter 7 (Heritage & Design) of the draft is of relevance and specifically Policy D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage).
- Camden Town Conservation Area Appraisal, 2007.

PROPOSALS

13. A summary of proposals has been provided below. Elements of particular note have been highlighted in **bold**. Please refer to the DAS, which accompanies this application, for associated plans and a more detailed description:

<p>Lower Ground Floor (LGF) – Flat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - retained as a separate demise; - conversion to a 2no. bed flat with improved circulation, space and daylight provision; - Existing interior almost entirely modern fabric – no features of heritage value present; - Extension of existing coal holes by 1.2m beneath front garden to provide subservient space in the form of a bedroom and en-suite; - original historic forms have been enhanced through retention of a. concave rear walls; b. vaulted ceilings; and, c. through the introduction of nibs to demarcate the 3no.volumes; - Existing opening to 3rd coal hole in-filled with opaque glazing to allow light into the en-suite but maintain privacy and also allows a reading of the historic form; - Enlargement of non-original opening to the closet wing; - Remove a partition and lower the sill of the window within the rear wall to admit more daylight and allow better circulation and connect living spaces.
<p>Ground Floor (GF)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing arrangement does not allow for the provision of kitchen living and dining spaces as it is too small; - Removal of rear closet wing and construction of a new closet wing and rear extension that responds to the neighbouring properties and is relocated to allow for a lightwell that provides for increased light down into LGF; - Pre-application advice has been taken on board the proposed closet wing is shallower than the existing, faced with high quality stock brick and recedes visually. Fenestration reflects the Georgian proportions of the windows above but in a modern style with fixed hidden-framed glazing; - Rear extension is modern and deliberately visually separate from the existing building. Reference to the Georgian architecture is made but expressed through modern detailing;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Further to neighbour consultation the height of the extension has been reduced by 300m; - Extension to be clad in light-coloured, thin format, handmade bricks to contrast with the London Stock brick of the existing building. A lighter brick, to reflect more daylight, is proposed; - Associated window frames and balustrades are proposed in bronze/bronze effect to sit against the lighter brick and reference the palette of colours within the garden; - A narrow rooflight is proposed to make a distinction between the existing building and new extension. This allows for additional light into the interior. A sloping ceiling directs views from the kitchen into the garden and creates privacy from the neighbouring flat; - historic features internally at GF are to be retained, repaired or refurbished where possible including reinstatement of picture rails, fireplaces and historic proportions of the principal rooms.
First Floor (FF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to become the master bedroom with en-suite; - soft division between the two rooms by opaque glazed folding doors/screens; - retention of the original proportions as far as possible, particularly to the front of the property; - original cornices, skirting, architraves, doors and sash boxes are to be refurbished and/or replaced (as necessary/to be agreed) like-for-like. Reinstatement of picture rail and existing fireplace also to be refurbished; - front balcony and railings to be refurbished as required; - original timber floorboards to be exposed and refurbished.
Second Floor (SF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - maintain 2 bedrooms; - alter layout to introduce family bathroom (raised as contention by the Council but maintained as part of Proposals and discussed further on); - New doors and architraves to match existing and non-original cornicing to be replaced with an appropriate heritage-style cornice;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - removal of existing ceiling above the staircase to create a vaulted ceiling and allow the form of the butterfly roof to be read internally.
Roof	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a roof extension was considered inappropriate at pre-application stage and has, therefore, been omitted from this Application; - the roof suffers from water ingress and it is proposed to lift slates and install a new breather membrane and then reinstate and replace the slates and gutter as required; - replacement of roof access hatch and installation of a rooflight above to stairwell. These elements have been designed not to be visible from the street.
Front Facade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - refurbish front facade and replace like-for-like all dilapidated single-glazed sash windows (refer to Window Conditions report); - repainting of window surroundings; - repointing where required; - repainting/repairing stucco; - repairing front door; - balcony and cast iron balustrades to be refurbished and repainted; - structural works to tie the front faced back to the party walls (refer to structural report).
Rear Facade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - demolition of 2-storey closet wing and reconstruction at a shallower depth (in line with no.45 Albert Street) to form a lightwell/courtyard in the remainder of the void, allowing light to LGF; - single storey extension; - refurbish and/or replace like-for-like all dilapidated single glazed sash windows (refer to Window Conditions report); - repair and repaint window surroundings and sills; - replace uPVC downpipes with high quality painted cast iron fittings; - areas of external brickwork that will become internal as part of proposals will be limewashed.

ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

The Site

14. The Site is principally of architectural interest through the quality and level of survival of its front elevation and the contribution it makes, aesthetically, to the wider designated (grade II) group.
15. It is of historic interest insofar as it forms part of a group of properties of common material, form and composition and forms part of an important period within the development and residential expansion in Camden during the 1840s.
16. The property is of no particular artistic value.
17. The property is of no particular archaeological value. It is of some limited evidential value as part of a wider terraced that survives to chart the history/evolution of this part of Camden.

The Camden Town Conservation Area

18. The Camden Town Conservation Area was designated in 1986 and extended in 1997. It covers an important part of Camden that includes the ancient north-south route, which became the High Street and which forms the basis for the development of the area over 200 years ago.
19. The Camden Town Conservation Area Appraisal (CTCAA) notes that it is 'typical of 19th century speculative development' with the plan form for the residential areas developing from a series of grid patterns and streets populated by long terraces of housing, set back from the road, including gardens.
20. The Site falls within Sub-Area 2, which covers the residential elements of the conservation area. The CTCAA describes residential development within the area as largely 'homogenous' in scale and character with properties generally of 3-storeys, some with attic storeys and most with front gardens.
21. Of Albert Street specifically the CTCAA notes the following to be of importance:
 - high quality streetscape;
 - uniform terraces to either side of the street;
 - wider than nearby streets;

- 'finely detailed brick and stucco terraces';
 - Nos 22-46 (east side) is the only terrace with historic mansard additions.
22. The appraisal notes that there have been a number of unsympathetic rear extensions, carried out under permitted development rights, which are visible along sides streets. In addition, inappropriate roof extensions are also mentioned with reference to those that are visible over the front eaves of the associated property and those where flat roofs have been introduced with front terraces.
23. The CTCAA goes on to reference that there are a variety of buildings styles towards the southern end of the street.
24. It is worth noting at this juncture that the more finely detailed properties are found on the eastern side of the road and north of No.47 (the Site), which is reflected in the list description.
25. Overall the conservation area derives the majority of its interest through the development and character of the commercial areas (Sub-Area 1, which is not discussed in detail within this Pre-Application Statement) and through the level of survival, within Sub-Area 2, of the long 19th century terraces, particularly to the west.
26. Albert Street is one of the better examples within the conservation area and it noteworthy given its generous width.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSALS

Impact on No.47 (the Site)

27. This section provides an assessment of the potential impact of proposals on the heritage significance of the Site. This should be read in conjunction with the accompanying DAS and annotated drawings prepared by Inside Out Architecture. The impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the conservation area has also been provided. Areas where repairs or replacements like-for-like are proposed have not been discussed in any detail, except where considered necessary owing to sensitivity, as they do not require listed building consent.
28. Historically appropriate detail will be reinstated where possible throughout the property through the reinstatement of picture rails, cornicing, skirting boards and architraves. Fireplaces will be retained or replaced with appropriate sympathetic alternatives.
29. The existing timber framed sash windows will be restored or replaced like-for-like as necessary.

Lower Ground Floor

Proposed Change	HC Comments
Retain LGF as separate demise.	The LGF was converted for use as a separate 1-bed until in 1980. The Client does not seek to reintegrate this self-contained flat back into the main house. No change. No harm to significance.
Alteration to convert the flat from a 1- to a 2-bedroom unit	The interior of the LGF flat is almost entirely modern and does not retain any original features of note. It has been altered considerable over the years and does not reflect its original historic form any longer. The majority of original features (fireplaces, mouldings and partitions) have been removed and the integrity of this floor has already been compromised.

	<p>Proposals would not result in the loss of an original arrangement and will affect largely modern fabric of limited heritage value.</p> <p>No harm to heritage significance.</p>
<p>Extend accommodation into coal-holes</p>	<p>Two of the three existing coal-holes have already been converted into a kitchenette. The proposed conversion of the third coal-hole to provide a small bedroom and en-suite would retain this space in a subservient/ ancillary use and reflect something that has already been undertaken at No.45 (ref LE9800527).</p> <p>A traditional casement window will be inserted into the existing opening, which will provide good daylight into the room beyond.</p> <p>Care has been taken to reinstate the vaulted ceilings, concave rear walls and overall character of the coal hole, which will retain a sense of its original purpose.</p> <p>This change will not be apparent from the street, only seen from within the private curtilage of the building. There will be limited loss of historic fabric due to proposals (please refer to Application drawings). Use is subservient to the main house, thereby in keeping with the historical hierarchy of spaces within the original building.</p> <p>There will be no harm to the significance of the building.</p>
<p>Demolish existing rear closet wing and relocate courtyard to the south of the accommodation</p>	<p>The existing closet wing is not original. It is un-insulated and suffers from water-ingress. Relocating the closet wing (which will only extend to GF) will allow for improved daylight into the LGF living spaces and a</p>

	<p>direct connection at GF (discussed further on) with the garden.</p> <p>This change affects subservient fabric of limited heritage value. It introduces a more ordered arrangement that allows for better circulation internally and improved living space. The new additional will be of considerably higher quality than the existing and will not be out of keeping with the rear of the property of the terrace (the latter comprising a mix of rear extensions and no one particular style – the majority of historic closet wing extensions, show in historic mapping have long since been altered, rebuilt or removed entirely).</p> <p>This change will not result in harm to the significance of the building.</p>
<p>Enlarge non-original opening and drop sill of existing window within rear wall to improve daylight level and improve circulation within the property.</p>	<p>This will result in the limited loss to some, subservient, historic fabric but retain an opening in the existing location. It affects a subservient part of the building of limited visibility and brings about a number of benefits, including an improved internal arrangement towards the rear of the property.</p> <p>This change will result in loss to a limited amount of historic fabric but this is not considered to result in harm to the significance of the property, which is principally derived from elsewhere (as summarised previously).</p>
<p>Introduce new partitions to form a protected means-of-escape from the rear</p>	<p>The arrangement at LGF is much altered. The proposed changes are required to meet current building regulations and do not result in any harm to the significance of the property.</p>

living spaces to the front door.	
----------------------------------	--

Ground Floor

Proposed Change	HC Comments
Relocation of existing courtyard at LGF (see above) allows for an extension to the rear of the building at GF that responds to the differing depths of the adjoining rear additions (to either side). This allows for the provision of a dining area to adjoin the kitchen and a more direct connection to the garden.	<p>The existing arrangement at GF does not provide enough space to accommodate a kitchen, living and dining space.</p> <p>The scale of the proposed extension has been designed to work with the existing rear additions of the neighbouring properties to either side.</p> <p>A contemporary appearance to extension is proposed to ensure it is seen as an addition to the existing building. Neighbouring rear additions are understated but in a variety of differing styles. Proposals reference Georgian architecture through window placement and proportions.</p> <p>It has not been designed as a 'lean-to' but as a permanent, high quality addition to the dwelling.</p> <p>The chosen materiality ties in with the existing building through the proposed use of hand-made bricks. These will be of a paler colour than that of the main house, to draw attention to the qualities of the existing London Stock brickwork. The chosen colouring has been suggested in order to bring extra light down into the LGF accommodation.</p>

	<p>Windows are contemporary bronze effect to reflect the colouring of the garden.</p> <p>A narrow rooflight separates the main house from the existing providing a visual cue as to the original line of the property and the start of the extension.</p> <p>A roof garden is proposed here to connect with the main garden below.</p> <p>This change allows for an improved internal arrangement that is not inappropriate for the property. It allows for living accommodation to be contained at ground floor that provides for a modern family.</p> <p>The existing internal hierarchy of the ground floor will change slightly due to proposals. The slight (less than substantial) harm caused through the rear extension and extended living space at this level, with minimal loss to historic fabric, is considered acceptable in heritage terms. It preserves the long-term interests of the building and keeps it in use to suit modern family living, as these properties need to do.</p> <p>This change is considered to be a 'managed change' in line with a conservation-led approach, which does not prevent change but seeks to manage it in an informed way to ensure the longevity and continued use of the building.</p> <p>The proposed changes reflect changes undertaken in the past, which were undertaken in order to allow the house to function efficiently as a dwelling, to suit the user needs of the late</p>
--	--

	20 th century. The proposals presented as part of this Application simply continue on that evolution in an informed, heritage-led manner.
Retain, reinstate and refurbish as many of the original historic features as possible. In addition it is proposed to reinstate a fireplaces within the living room and repair/refurbish existing cornices, skirting boards, doors and sash boxes as required.	<p>The property has lost many of its original details, fixtures and fittings. It is the Client's wish to reinstate traditional detailing befitting of the building that reinstates much of the character that was lost during the extensive works undertaken in the 1960s and 1980s.</p> <p>This approach is considered to be a heritage benefit that enhances the building's heritage value*.</p>

First Floor

Proposed Change	HC Comments
The existing arrangement includes living space spread over GF and FF. It is proposed, therefore, to give over the FF to a master bedroom suite.	<p>The proportions and layout of the FF are important and part of the historical hierarchy of the building. This has been taken into consideration in the design of the master suite, which retains the original proportions of the principal front room.</p> <p>No harm to significance.</p>
Original skirting boards, cornices, architraves, doors and sash boxes to be repair or replaced (like-for-like) as required.	*As previously.

Second Floor

Proposed Change	HC Comments
------------------------	--------------------

<p>Relocate existing family bathroom from GF closet wing to SF between the bedrooms.</p>	<p>The bathroom to be split between two rooms as no other arrangement allowed for the provision of 2 bedrooms and a bathroom at this level.</p> <p>The SF is of lesser significance than the lower floors in terms of hierarchy and there is limited historic detailing remaining. Most important elements (i.e. staircase and windows to be refurbished) are to be retained and remain wholly unaffected.</p> <p>In order for the house to function effectively as a family home it makes sense that the family bathroom is relocated to the second floor. This updates the internal arrangement to suit modern family needs and this is considered acceptable and in the best interests of the building long-term.</p> <p>No harm to significance.</p>
<p>Removal of ceiling above stair.</p>	<p>It is proposed to remove the ceiling above the staircase and open it up to the rafters as a feature internally and in order to create a greater sense of space.</p> <p>There would be some loss to historic fabric due to this change, which will need to be weighed in the planning balance. However, this would not affect the overall appreciation of internal hierarchy, which will be retained.</p> <p>This change triggers paragraph 134 of the NPPF and is considered to amount to slight, less than substantial harm, through loss of fabric.</p>

Roof

Proposed Change	HC Comments
<p>The existing roof, which comprises historic and more recent timbers and retains its original form, is to be retained. However, it is suffering from water ingress. Therefore it is proposed to remove the tiles, replace timbers where rotten/as required, install a new breather membrane and reinstate/replace the tiles as required.</p>	<p>The existing butterfly roof is of heritage value as an original roof form on Albert Street. Proposals do not affect this but simply address the existing issues with water ingress.</p> <p>There will be no harm to significance due to this element of proposals.</p>
<p>Replacement of existing roof hatch and introduction of a small skylight to provide more light over the stairwell.</p>	<p>These two elements are small and discrete and will be located in a position that is not visible from street level and will have no impact on the character or appearance of the conservation area or the appreciation of the building as a whole/as part of the wider terrace.</p> <p>These changes will not result in harm to the significance of the building, as highlighted earlier within this report.</p>

Exterior – Front Facade

30. It is proposed to repair and refurbish the existing facade including: refurbishment or replacement like-for-like of the existing, dilapidated single-glazed sash windows (associated sash boxes to be retained and repairs as stated previously). Existing brickwork will be re-pointed where necessary and the stucco repaired. The front door will also be refurbished.

31. These amount to repairs and retain all important aspects of the facade unaffected.

32. The Proposals do not result any notable change to the appearance of the building. The proposed repairs bring about an improvement to the facade and elevated the contribution made by No.47 within the wider designated group.
33. Improvements to the overall appearance of the front garden are also proposed. This will bring about an enhancement to the streetscene and the conservation area and provide a more fitting setting to the building.

Exterior – Rear Facade

34. Alterations to the rear facade largely affect an area of the building that has already been subject to change and is of lesser detail and order. The closet wing replacement and single storey rear extension are in-keeping with the character of the property and reflect the Georgian character using contemporary and traditional materials to sit in sympathy with the original building but be read independently from it – making a distinction between old and new, which the officers at LB Camden were positive about during pre-application discussion.
35. In conjunction with the above, the proposed repairs (refurbished windows, and repointing where necessary) will notably improve the quality and appearance of the rear elevation, which is largely only appreciable from within the private curtilage of the property itself and the upper floors of the neighbouring terraces.
36. The proposed extension brings about a considerable improvement to the appearance of the property at ground floor level (please refer to accompanying photographs). The existing closet wing is poor quality and the proposed closet wing is modest in scale and appearance and brings about a far more ordered and elegant ground floor elevation.
37. No harm is considered to result from the removal of the existing closet wing. The proposed new extension is considered to be of high quality and a positive addition the benefits the building long-term. It does not result in the loss of any significance historic fabric and affects a subservient elevation that is largely only visible from within the private curtilage of the building and generally of limited visibility.

Impact on the Camden Town Conservation Area

38. The conservation area is split into 2 sub-areas (commercial and residential). Sub-Area 2 covers residential and the Site falls within this area. Special interest is principally derived from the good survival of 19th century terraces; their overall uniformity (bulk, scale, height, materiality etc.); the presence of front gardens; and, the predominant use of yellow stock brick, rusticated ground floors, stucco mouldings and natural slate roofs.
39. Alteration is evident across this grade II Albert Street terrace. The terrace itself derives the majority of its special interest through its group value and the overall, combined, aesthetic of the group. Each one of the properties is best appreciated as part of that group, and is of greater value when considered as part of it than when taken independently and viewed on its own individual merits.
40. The proposals do not result in a notable change to the principal front elevation of the Site and repair and replace (like-for-like) the existing fabric of the facade where necessary, bringing out an overall visual improvement to the building within the street scene and the conservation area. The benefits of the refurbishment of the existing facade are further amplified through the proposed new landscaping.
41. Proposed alterations to the rear of the property are of limited visibility from within the conservation area, and largely only appreciable from within the private curtilage of the building and the upper floors of the surrounding terraces. In addition, the rear elevations of the majority of buildings within this terrace have been subject to change and vary greatly in quality and design. The traditional closet wing extensions that would once have been typical across all properties, as historic mapping demonstrates, have largely been removed and the overall pattern of development to the rear has been compromised over a long period of time.
42. There will be no harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area due to proposals. Most specifically, those parts of the conservation area that contribute most to its special interest remain wholly unaffected.

Policy Compliance

43. The proposals are of high quality and the Client's intention is to look after the best interests of the building whilst allowing it to function as a successful family home. The approach taken has been to incorporate contemporary design solutions,

making use of traditional and modern materials, so that there is a distinction between old and new and the original line of the building to the rear can still be read both internally and externally.

44. Original detailing will be retained and repaired where possible and new detailing will be introduced of an appropriate style to suit the character of the property. Picture rails, cornicing, skirting boards and fireplaces will all be retained, repaired or reintroduced where necessary.
45. Proposals are in accordance with local policy and provide a high quality new addition to the building that is sympathetic to its character and results in minimal loss to historic fabric. Alterations largely affected areas of the building that have already been subject to considerable change or are of lesser detail and order. The principal elevation, fronting Albert Street, will remain wholly unchanged with only the necessary repairs being undertaken to bring the building back to a high standard. This will considerably improve the building's appearance within the street scene and, most importantly, as part of a terrace of listed buildings within a conservation area.
46. There will be some loss to historic fabric and a change to the footprint of the building at lower-ground and ground floor to provide additional living accommodation. These changes are considered to amount to less than substantial harm in terms of the NPPF and need to be weighed in the planning balance. From a heritage perspective, there will be considerable heritage gain through investment in the building to restore it to a family dwelling and secure its long-term occupation. Its contribution to the terrace will be heightened and there will be a notable enhancement to the street scene and within this part of the conservation area.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

47. This Heritage Statement provides an appraisal of the significance of the Site at 47 Albert Street, along with an assessment of the character and appearance of the Camden Town Conservation Area.
48. This Statement satisfies the requirements of Paragraph 128 of the NPPF insofar as it provides a proportionate assessment of the significance of designated heritage assets affected the proposals. It goes on to assess the impact of proposals on that significance.
49. The proposals presented in this Application are considered informed and appropriate. They preserve the heritage interests of the building and, internally, reinstate original features, improve the layout of the upper floors and retain the original sense of internal hierarchy.
50. External changes proposed within this Application will bring about a change within the conservation area but are not considered to result in harm to the area's character and appearance and overall special interest for the reasons noted previously. Improve landscaping will bring about an enhancement at street level, whilst the external alterations to the rear of the property are of limited visibility from within the conservation area and affect a subservient part of the building that has already been subject to change.
51. The proposed rear extension remains in line with neighbouring properties and steps out from the original footprint of the listed building.
52. In conclusion, the proposals are considered informed and appropriate. They accord with local and national planning policy and guidance and look after the long-term interests of the building. There will be no harm to the significance of the conservation area. There will be slight (less than substantial) harm to the listed building with respect to one element of the proposals, which will bring about a change to the overall footprint of the building at ground floor to the rear. This change is considered informed and needs to be weighed in the planning balance. The proposals are considered to bring about a number of heritage benefits through the repair of the existing building, improved landscaping, secured use as a family home and the addition of a high quality extension of limited visibility to the rear.