

PD10346/TM/SH/TT

email: [Tim.Miles@Montagu-evans.co.uk](mailto:Tim.Miles@Montagu-evans.co.uk)  
[Timur.Tatlioglu@Montagu-evans.co.uk](mailto:Timur.Tatlioglu@Montagu-evans.co.uk)

16 February 2018

Nick Baxter  
Camden Council  
5 Pancras Square  
London  
N1C 4AG

CHARTERED SURVEYORS

5 Bolton Street  
London W1J 8BA

Tel: 020 7493 4002

Fax: 020 7312 7548

[www.montagu-evans.co.uk](http://www.montagu-evans.co.uk)

Planning Portal Reference: PP-06276519

Dear Nick

**CAPO DI MONTE, WINDMILL HILL, NW3  
APPLICATION FOR LISTED BUILDING CONSENT  
PLANNING (LISTED BUILDINGS AND CONSERVATION AREAS) ACT 1990.  
APPLICATION REFERENCE 2017/4414/L  
HERITAGE STATEMENT**

The above application reference was registered on 14<sup>th</sup> August with the following description of development:

*“Alterations in connection to the creation of a single dwelling house comprising internal and external works including replacement of floor treatments, lowering of basement floor, drylining to basement walls, use of basement void as accommodation, installation of underfloor heating, replacement of chimneypiece in entrance hall and other associated works.”*

During the course of determination, a number of amendments have been made to the application proposals as a result of comments received from the planning authority. These amendments are contained within the set of drawings issued to you directly on December 19<sup>th</sup> 2017, and again on 9<sup>th</sup> January 2019. I understand from our subsequent discussions that the works shown in those drawings are considered acceptable to the planning authority.

You have requested a further justification of the proposed works in the form of a Heritage Statement. This letter and its appendices performs that function and is an edited version of the letter that accompanied the original application (also in that original application take to be a Heritage Statement).

I trust that the receipt of this letter will enable the issuing of the listed building consent decision, as I believe that it was the only outstanding item.

**Background**

On 14<sup>th</sup> August 2015, planning permission (2014/6987/P) was granted for works at Capo Di Monte for the:

*“Change of use from two residential units to a single dwelling house, reconfigured rear extension, extension to existing basement and associated internal and external alterations, landscaping and parking.”*

Listed building consent (2014/7133/L) was also granted on the 14<sup>th</sup> August 2015 for the following:

*“Alterations in connection to the creation of a single dwelling house from two residential units; including alterations to an existing rear extensions, a basement extension, internal alterations and external alterations including new and replacement windows.”*

The 2014 applications were submitted following the Applicant’s acquisition of the property. At that time it was evident that the house was in a very poor state of repair. As was evident in the Heritage Statement that accompanied those applications, much of the property had been refurbished iteratively throughout the twentieth century, particularly in the 1950’s when comprehensive internal works of refurbishment were undertaken. Such works included the laying of the concrete floors in places and re-plastering throughout with gypsum based plasters. Many of the decorative features within the property are from that period. The property was again refurbished in the 1990’s (for instance, comprising the replacement of the front wall of the central bay of the property in modern materials).

The house was previously arranged as two flats, and the Applicant’s application proposals were to revert the property to a single dwelling. The previous existence of the property as two lateral flats was harmful to its special interest, both in terms of the manner in which the property was arranged and also the alterations that had taken place to the layout to allow it to be used as such. The rearrangement of the building to a use as a single dwelling has enhanced the interest of the building, and in developing the proposals, the Applicant took care to reinstate historic features where possible; for instance the permissions allowed for the removal of the modern chimney stacks and reinstatement with chimney stacks of the historic profile.

The Applicant has since implemented both the planning permission and listed building consent, carrying out a number of works to a high standard and which have led to enhancements to the building as originally envisaged. Some of the works were, however, unauthorised and the Applicant understands that consent should be sought for these. Those works have been identified by the Council in concert with the Applicant following two site visits on 7<sup>th</sup> April and 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017.

### **Statement of Significance**

The attached document at Appendix 1 is a Statement of Significance prepared in accordance with paragraph 128 of the NPPF. This extracted from the Heritage Statement prepared by Turley Associates to accompany the original applications at the site.

Capo di Monte originally comprised a pair of mid-eighteenth century cottages. They were joined to form a single property in the first half of the twentieth century, later converted to flats, before being refurbished as a single family dwelling following the grant of planning permission and listed building consent in 2014.

The property was first illustrated in John Rocques’s map of 1746, and shortly after on the 1762 Map of Hampstead. The building faced towards Judge’s Walk, the tree-lined avenue. By 1850 the grounds of the property were bordered by a brick wall to the rear, and dwarf wall to the front with railings and rendered piers.

There are a number of historical associations with notable occupants. The property was occupied by Sarah Siddons (1755-1831), a leading actress of her day made famous by her role as Lady Macbeth.

Cartographic evidence suggests that the main alteration during the property during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was the demolition of a three storey brick structure in the southernmost part of the site.

By c1929 the two properties had been amalgamated and a large rear extension added in addition to the garage. The rear extension retained some early twentieth century fabric (e.g. fireplace and parquet flooring) at the time of the 2014 application. It was considered these elements had no particular architectural value.

Over the course of the Twentieth Century piecemeal alterations were made to the building:

- Alteration to the northern elevation with the insertion of high level windows and weatherboarding;
- Removal of the railings to the front boundary and replacement with a boundary wall;
- Rendering of the chimney stacks; and
- Alterations to the interior during the late twentieth century when consent was granted for a range of internal and external alterations (Camden Refs: 95/70293 & L/96/00936) including fixing shut the door in rear elevation, new roof light in rear conservatory and rebuilding part of the front elevation including replacement of four sash windows.

The latest phase of works are the result of the 2014 applications (2014/6987/P and 2014/7133/L). The permitted alterations can be summarised as follows:

Basement Extension – The provision of a connecting basement link beneath the rear garden;

Rear Extension – reconfigure the existing studio with a larger rear extension (now implemented).

Existing Garage – the existing garage to be converted to accommodation.

Other alterations – a number of other alterations were permitted to both the interior and exterior.

The works consented as part of the 2014 applications rationalised and improved circulation through the building, while also retaining the existing cellular character of the listed building. Significantly, a number of works were considered to better reveal the significance of the building, including the reinstatement of the front boundary railings.

In summary, the Statement of significance concludes:

- The property has its origins as a pair of modest mid-18<sup>th</sup> Century houses, albeit much altered;
- Post 1929, the properties became a single house, that was then sub-divided again in the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century in a non-original configuration;
- The architectural interest of the building is largely derived from its 18<sup>th</sup> Century origins as reflected in its character, materiality and detailing;
- Elements of the historic plan form and interior features that remain within the body of the building also make a contribution to its significance;
- 20<sup>th</sup> Century additions make a more limited contribution to the significance of the building;
- There is a record of various alterations to the exterior, including the chimney stacks, elevations and boundaries;
- In the 1990s consent was granted for various internal alterations and the substantial rebuilding of the central part of the front elevation;
- Internally, important features such as stairs are later replacements;
- Modern wall finishes have been applied throughout, as a result of mid-20<sup>th</sup> Century refurbishment;
- Various modern alterations at cellar level detracted from the significance of the building, including the introduction of concrete beams;
- There have been various alterations to the ground floor plan form which are described as 'significant alterations' and lack original detailing.

- The first floor retains more of the historic layout with only minor interventions at this level, but the appurtenances associated with the division of the property into two lateral flats were harmful to the significance of the building
- Historic Interest derives from the strong associations with past residents of the property.

Full details of the assessment are contained within **Appendix 1** of this letter.

Thus the Statement of significance is representative of the position of the house prior to the package of works that are the subject of this application for listed building consent.

We trust that this satisfies the planning authority's requirements regarding the applicant's assessment of the significance of the building.

### **The contents of this application**

The works for which listed building consent are now sought can be summarised as follows (A room key is provided on the plans submitted within the application drawings):

- Alterations to architectural detailing such as skirting, cornices and architraves;
- Alterations to floor treatments;
- Installation of wall lining to basement rooms;
- The reversion of the basement void to the consented condition (i.e. underpinned) and backfilled with soil;
- Installation of Under Floor Heating;
- Alterations to lighting within the property;
- Alteration to layout of room 12;
- Re-location of door opening in room 11;
- Removal of unauthorised bathroom in room 14;
- Alteration to layout of bathroom in room 16;
- Installation of panelling on west elevation of room 10;
- Alteration to layout of bathroom in room 15;
- Addition of historic detailing to the replaced weatherboarding to rear elevation (the weatherboarding was replaced on a like for like basis as a repair and which we consider did not require consent as works of repair) ;
- Installation of new Rain Water Goods (RWGs) replacing plastic guttering;
- Alterations to front piers and installation of keypad system;
- Other miscellaneous minor alterations as identified on the drawings.

### **Assessment of the Proposals**

The alterations noted within this letter have either already been completed, or would be implemented upon the grant of planning permission and listed building consent. This section assesses such alterations against the relevant statutory provisions and planning policy.

A number of the works that are contained within the application before the Council have already been assessed during the determination of application references 2014/6987/P and 2014/7133/L. Thus the majority of works have been assessed by the Council and have found to be acceptable, with reference to the pre-existing state as described in the Statement of Significance attached to this letter.

The Heritage Report submitted with 2014/6987/P and 2014/7133/L concluded that:

*“With respect to paragraphs 131, 132 and 137 of the Framework, the particular significance of the statutorily listed building and Hampstead Conservation Area (and the contribution made by the site to this significance will both individually and cumulatively sustain, and in a number of ways enhance their heritage significance”*

The contents of the application now before the Council contains also the contents of the applications 2014/6987/P and 2014/7133/L and thus the conclusions drawn with regard to those elements of work is replicated here and there is no reason to dispute these conclusions. Thus this represents the baseline assessment, and the paragraphs that follow assess the effect of the additional items now included in this application.

A number of works are proposed that would reverse unauthorised changes to the listed building. These have been deemed acceptable by the Council in ongoing discussions because they revert to either the pre-existing condition or the permitted 2014 applications:

- Alteration to layout of room 12;
- Removal of unauthorised bathroom in room 14;

The remaining items are assessed below, and this includes those items now before the planning authority that were not part of application references 2014/6987/P and 2014/7133/L.

Overall, we conclude that the works that form the application now in front of the Council preserve the special interest of the building.

#### Architraves, skirting and cornices

Close examination of the property reveal that many of the pre-existing architraves were badly decayed and beyond repair at the time of granting the 2014 applications. Most of the architraves were modern replacements in any event, of negligible historic value beyond comprising a record of the comprehensive refurbishment works that took place in the 1950's, themselves of negligible architectural interest.

**Appendix 2.0** shows the condition of existing architraves contained within the house, and that they were modern in nature.

Where architraves were intact (i.e. free from decay), they have been retained. Where they have been removed due to decay, they have been replaced on the basis of the ovolo architrave within the dining room which was identified as a template (see attached photograph and drawing at **Appendix 3.0**). On this basis, the works have comprised like for like repair of modern materials.

Notwithstanding that works of repair would not normally require listed building consent, we have included this aspect in this regularising application to permit the ovolo architrave and plans annotating where architraves have been replaced.

The majority of the house contained modern skirting with a square edged profile. Much of the skirting was rotten and decayed at the bottom, or it disguised (inactive) rot to retained panelling behind, and thus had been installed in modern times to disguise it.

Application drawings contain a detailed section of the new skirting which has replaced decayed skirting, which is of an appropriate simple design, based on a design of Georgian origin, appropriate to the age of the property. Details of the new skirting and annotated plans where the pre-existing skirting had been removed and replaced is provided within the application material. A plainer square edged skirting design is utilised at the basement and first floor levels.

Given the decayed nature of the existing architraves and skirting, and that they were modern in nature, we do not consider that this aspect of the works has caused any harm to the special interest of the building and consequently complies with national and local planning policy.

### Floor treatment

#### *Replacement of floorboards*

As discussed during the pre-application discussions, there is a considerable body of evidence to show that pre-existing floorboards have been altered and/or removed throughout the property prior to our Applicant's acquisition of the building (see Specifications of work at **Appendix 5.0**). There were sections of concrete in place (for instance in the entrance hall), and extensive use of plywood in place of floorboards.

Where floorboards were still in existence, the Applicant sought advice on the ability to salvage them and we are advised these were assessed as decayed, suffering from beetle infestation and not capable of salvage or reuse.

The Applicant recognises this information should have been shared with the Council at the time of this discovery. However, we are advised that any renewal of the floor would have required the removal of the remaining pre-existing floorboards that remained because these were not usable.

In order to regularise the situation, the Applicant proposes the reinstatement of traditional oak timber floorboards within the sitting room (room 2), the dining room (room 3), the library/hall (room 6) and southern hallway (room 7) and the main entrance hall (room 1) all at ground floor, and the landings at first floor. This would be an enhancement over the previously pre-existing condition, and the floorboards would be laid directly on top of the previously existing joist in the traditional fashion.

The Applicant proposes the use of reclaimed floorboards with an age of approximately 150 years. While the boards are well-seasoned and contain a number of marks indicating their age including wear and weathering, the intention is that the boards would be sanded, oiled and laid so that the varying length of boards are as uniform as possible throughout the property. They would retain a patina of age consistent with the character of the property.

A sample of a floorboard has been provided to the planning authority, which we believe is considered acceptable.

#### *Entrance Hall*

The entrance hall (Room 1) has been substantially altered since the mid-twentieth century. In the 1950's, the specifications of works indicate that dry rot was found in the floor joists, and the entire floor was stripped out. Some new wood joists were installed, and a concrete beam and steel joists followed by the introduction of a new concrete floor. The concrete beam was previously visible in the basement and consent was granted for removal of this beam as part of the 2014 applications.

Contemporaneous to the concrete floor, the pre-existing wood staircase was replaced with a reinforced concrete staircase supported on a new brick wall built in cement and sand.

The whole area was partitioned off to create a corridor, and (gypsum based) sirapite plaster was used to re-plaster the entire space. As such, the pre-existing condition of this room was substantially altered (including the plan form) and comprised modern materials.

The consented removal of the concrete beam at basement level as part of the 2014 applications necessitated the removal of the pre-existing reinforced concrete floor. The floor was replaced by the Applicant with a traditional suspended timber floor, with a stone floor finish. These works were unauthorised. The stone floor has now been removed, and the finish will revert to timber floorboards. We consider that this finished state is an enhancement by way of the removal of earlier harmful alterations and the creation of a floor constructed in a traditional materials.

We consider that the replacement of previous existing floors with historic floorboards in the majority of the ground floor (in the principal spaces) to be a benefit to the property. Likewise the removal of the concrete floor in the southern entrance hall and creation of a suspended timber floor with tiling in the main entrance hall are also benefits to the building.

The client is proposing to lay oak floorboards on joists in a substantial area within the property both to replace rotten previously removed floorboards, and floorboards that have been removed in the past and replaced with ply. On balance we consider that this approach to the flooring at the ground floor property to be beneficial to the building.

#### *Parquet Flooring*

The rear extension (the kitchen) retained some early twentieth century fabric notably the parquet flooring. This has been salvaged through the refurbishment phase, and reclaimed parquet to match the existing has also been used. The Applicant has applied this flooring in rooms 10, 12, 13 and 15.

We consider that the use of parquet flooring in these locations will preserve the special interest of the listed building. This type of flooring was commonly used at the beginning of the twentieth century, from private residential properties to commercial properties in central London.

In particular, the panelled room is already of a particular status given the extent and type of decoration present, and the use of parquet in other locations represents a continuation of the history of the property by re-using good quality flooring and maintaining a continuity in the use of materials. Furthermore, the reuse of the parquet represents its sustainability benefits by preserving fabric of some age, and replacing older fabric that was of such poor condition that it could not be reclaimed.

#### Lowering of basement floor and replacement of fireplace

The 2014 approved drawing references 1249/AP06 (proposed section AA) and AP07 (proposed section BB) illustrate that the floor was permitted to be lowered by 150mm.

During implementation the north basement was lowered in accordance with the approved drawings, though the south basement was lowered 90mm lower than was consented (i.e. a lowering of 240mm).

We consider that the lowering of the floor in the south basement as of itself, by a slightly deeper extent than as shown on the approved drawings, is not material in listed building terms, and is not harmful to the special historic or architectural interest of the building.

The southern part of the basement is marked on the drawings to be used for a study, library and bathroom. Clearly these are habitable spaces, although they do not represent primary living spaces in the property and so the vertical hierarchy of the building is maintained.

In terms of the historic boiler within the study, the floor has been lowered around the boiler. The boiler has been retained in its historic location and is retained.

In terms of the chimney piece in the library in southern basement level, the lowering of the floor had implications for the retention of the chimney piece. We understand that it was not possible to reinstate the fireplace (as identified on the approved drawings) because it was rendered into the wall. The fireplace was therefore replaced with a plain stone fireplace of similar configuration to the pre-existing, although the drawings now submitted for approval show the existing fireplace to be replaced with a new fire-surround to match the pre-existing relative to the newly lowered floor level. This alteration would preserve the interest of the building.

#### Basement Drylining

The 2014 approved application drawings are clear that the space was to be used for habitable accommodation. The approved drawing 1249/AP02 shows the southern basement to be used as a bathroom, study and library. The northern basement is indicated to be used as a plant and utility room, annotated also as a linen airing cupboard and linen storage. Furthermore, the application drawings are clear that the basement was to be underpinned and a new reinforced concrete floor installed 150mm lower than the existing. These details necessarily imply that the rooms would require a finish and to be lined with plaster in order to make them suitable for habitation.

In order to ensure that the spaces can be safely inhabited, the Applicant received advice from an approved building inspector that damp proofing was required as the basement was damp, which was corroborated by a damp survey.

The proposed means of damp proofing and lining the basement is shown on the drawing at **Appendix 6.0**. This shows a membrane dry lining system, which represents conservation best practice in listed building terms; the installation of the system requires minimal intervention and would be reversible in the future and does not cause damage by means of displaced moisture anywhere else in the property.

The Applicant is now seeking consent for the unauthorised means of damp proofing. The details and locations are shown in the submitted drawings. We do not consider, given the terms of the approved drawings and the scope of works that have been undertaken that the lining nor damp proofing to be harmful to the special interest of the listed building, and thus the special interest of the building will be preserved.

#### Basement Void

The drawings now before you allow for the return of this space to its approved, underpinned and concrete lined state. The application also makes provision for the backfilling of this space with soil. By returning the void to its approved underpinned state, the special interest of the building is preserved.

#### Underfloor Heating ("UFH")

The Applicant has installed UFH at ground floor and basement. Two different underfloor heating types have been installed due to the varying floor conditions throughout the house.

First, UFH has been installed within the new screed within the permitted new kitchen. We do not consider this to be harmful to the building, given that consent was granted for the reconstruction of this part of the building and the underfloor heating has been laid within the new concrete floor.

Similarly room 5 (cloak room), and room 4 (the snug), and the basement, all contain either pre-existing concrete floors or in the case of the basement, new concrete floors laid (as approved). These contain a similar fast flow underfloor heating system within the screed. We do not consider the installation of this to be harmful to the building given that the underfloor heating is installed within either pre-existing or new (consented) concrete floors.



In the rooms with existing joists and timber floors, UFH has been installed in low profile diffuser panels, between the pre-existing wooden joists. This has been installed within the entrance hall (room 1 - within in the new suspended timber floor), the sitting room (room 2), the dining room (room 3) and the library (room 6). The application drawings illustrate the detail of this system, which has been designed and installed to avoid intervention within floor joists (and so laid between the joists) and so is not harmful to the character of the listed building. We have issued a drawing in our letter of 20th September (and now forming part of the package for approval) which shows that the UFH is to be serviced with only one small notch at one end of each joist. We do not consider this to be harmful to the special interest of the building, and thus the special interest of the building is preserved.

We consider, therefore, that the UFH complies with national and local planning policy.

#### Lighting and downlights

As part of the refurbishment following the 2014 Applications, the lighting of the property was re-appraised. The Applicant installed downlights in a number of principal historic rooms where they were not already present.

The Applicant proposes to retain downlights in the rooms where they were already present (listed building consent was granted in the 1990s). Thus the drawings before you now allow for the downlights to be removed throughout, with the exception of the snug (ground floor north rear room) where they already existed and were consented in the 1990s, the new modern kitchen extension, and the basement.

This is consistent with the pre-existing situation and thus the special interest of the building is preserved.

#### Chimney pieces

As part of the implementation of the 2014 applications, consent was granted to reinstate a working fireplace within the entrance hall (room 1). The Applicant has installed a stone chimney piece that matches the detailing of that in the panelled room (room 10). Through pre-application discussions it was agreed that this chimney piece should reflect the status of this part of the house, and house more widely.

Following discussions with the Council, the Applicant seeks consent to remove the cushion moulding and mantel shelf of the chimney piece in the entrance hall (room 1) and replace with a timber shelf. The overall form and appearance will be similar to that found in the panelled room (room 10). This will significantly reduce the grandeur of the chimney piece within the context of the space.

We consider that this alteration will preserve the hierarchy of space within the building, and in turn, the character of the listed building. Consequently, the works will comply with national and local planning policy.

The application seeks consent for the removal of the unauthorised chimneypieces installed in the sitting room and dining room. The application seeks consent for the reinstatement of pre-existing chimneypieces to match the previous non-historic pieces. As this element of the proposals applies for the reversion to the pre-existing condition, the special interest of the building is preserved.

My client has confirmed that the insert in the ground floor dining room is the relocated insert from the panelled room upstairs, as suggested by our recent examination of the photographs. The drawings have been annotated to show the relocation of the insert to allow the gas fire to provide heating in the panelled room. We do not consider that the gas fire itself requires listed building consent given that it is free standing and only fixed to the building by the means of a gas pipe, and the relocation of the fireplace insert is not harmful to the special interest of the building.

### 'Jib' Door to Bedroom 1

A historic plan from 1946 illustrates an opening between bedroom 1 and the adjoining bedroom. Thus there is evidence that an opening already existed in this location. During refurbishment works the door was re-opened, thus reinstating a previous opening. We consider that this work does not cause any harm to the significance of the listed building.

### Weatherboarding and rear detailing

The replacement of the weatherboarding to the rear of the property was authorised in the 2014 applications, stating on the approved drawings "*Work to restore white painted timber slats*". The application form stated: "*Repair or replace all weatherboarding like for like where necessary.*" The Council did not impose any conditions requiring details of the work to be approved prior to commencement.

We are advised that the weatherboarding was entirely in a poor state of repair and was replaced on a like for like basis. Photographic evidence of its parlous state, with vegetation growing behind, is included in **Appendix 8.0**. It was deemed necessary to replace all the weatherboarding.

Furthermore, there is evidence that the weatherboarding was replaced wholesale during the 1950s and so the fabric that was removed in the more recent works had no intrinsic historic value. A photograph from the 1953 shows the appearance of the western elevation of the northern part of the building (**Appendix 9.0**). In comparison with the photograph taken prior to the works (**Appendix 9.0**), you will note the very poor condition particularly at first floor and above. This appearance contrasts starkly with the 1953 photograph, where the boarding appears new and with clean edges.

This contextual information shows that the refurbishment works to the rear of the property has preserved the character of the building. It appears "new", but only in the same way that the weatherboarding appeared new in 1953. Moreover, it must be a material consideration and heritage benefit that these works have removed a risk to this designated heritage asset by allaying decay via water ingress, and thus helped to secure the future of the building. They will in time acquire a natural patina.

That the weatherboarding was to be replaced as necessary was in the listed building consent application. The work has been undertaken in accordance with condition 2 of the 2014 listed building consent. We do not consider there is a breach of listed building control in this regard. The Applicant acknowledges, however, that detailing such as the vertical posts have not been reinstated. These details are shown in the submitted drawings supporting this application and will ensure that the works preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building.

The application also proposes the reinstatement of architraves and detailing on the rear elevation to reinstate the pre-existing condition. As this proposes the reversion to the pre-existing condition, there is no effect on this historic interest of the building and its interest will be preserved.

We agree that a lead flap detail has been applied to the parapet at the top of the elevation. In the "as existing" condition, the previous lead capping detail (which also wrapped over the lip of the timber cladding) provided insufficient protection from rainwater which meant that ingress took place behind the parapet, and between the rear elevation and the roof.

The lead flap detail is in fact a like for like replacement in terms of materiality. It was added to improve the rainwater performance. As a matter of principle a pre-existing detail should not be retained if that detail comprises a defect in the property.

In order to minimise the visual effect of this new addition, the proposals have been altered to ensure that the detailing is as close as possible to the pre-existing while ensuring that the performance of the building is

maintained. The lead has been trimmed back to reduce the depth of it and a small wooden batten inserted behind the lip to replicate the projection of the pre-existing.

### Rainwater Goods (“RWGs”)

During the refurbishment of the building the rainwater goods were renewed and replaced. There are two main areas where this occurred.

The first was above the front bay window where a plastic gutter was crudely detailed. **Appendix 10.0** illustrates the awkward arrangement of the guttering in relation to the cornice. This arrangement had historically caused overspill which had resulted in rot on the fascia board behind. The gutter was replaced and the original lead hopper located above the primary entrance door was carefully cleaned and reinstated.

The hoppers on the north wall were repaired where possible. One hopper had to be replaced on the front façade as it was badly corroded beyond repair. Another hopper was replaced on the south façade as it was broken and also corroded. Photographs of the replacement hoppers are attached at **Appendix 11.0**.

We consider that the alterations of the RWGs has improved the appearance of the front elevation by removing an awkward plastic gutter, which in any case was leading to harm of the listed building, while also refurbishing the other elements to secure the future conservation of the building.

All existing gutter-work that has been replaced was plastic, and has been replaced with cast-iron. The lead hopper above the front door is the same as pre-existing. One hopper on the south wall and one on the front façade were replaced because they were corroded beyond repair – the one on the front replaced with one relocated from the rear. We understand that the pre-existing hoppers on the north wall were plastic. We do not consider these works to be harmful to the building – indeed the replacement of plastic pipework with cast iron is plainly an enhancement.

The works comply with national and local planning policy by at least preserving the significance of the building.

### Chimney and Chimney Stacks

Works to the chimney stacks formed part of the 2014 applications and are shown in the approved drawing references: 1249/S-06, S07, S08, S09, S10, S11.

The design of the chimneys in the proposed drawings, shown on the equivalent AP reference numbers, clearly illustrates the re-profiling of each stack. These are accompanied by an annotation stating “*reinstating to historic/original profile*”. Drawing references numbers SK06 – SK08 provide more detail of the alterations. Clearly the changes in the profile of chimney stacks could only be achieved by the rebuilding of the stacks.

The drawings were annotated to ascertain that the historic chimney pots would be retained.

The existing situation was in fact that there was a combination of three ring louvre chimney pots on the east side elevation and round tapered and traditional canon mouth pots on the southern side.

The Applicant’s appointed specialist chimney restorer advised that the chimney pots required an internal diameter sufficient to pass the relevant flues to cope with adequate clearance from the reinstated working fireplaces. The existing chimney pots did not have this required diameter.

As the front three chimneys served working fireplaces, the existing chimney pots were not fit for purpose and therefore two of the existing traditional canon mouthed chimneys were reused on the rear chimney (which is not serving working fireplaces) and like for like cannon chimney pots were selected for installation on the working

chimneys. Note that elevations dated 1929 (see attached at **Appendix 12.0**) do not indicate any chimney pots. This suggests that the chimney pots are no older than early/mid twentieth century.

We consider the replacement chimneys to be of an appropriate design and detailing. Two of the chimney pots have been relocated. The remaining chimney pots (louvre chimneys) were replaced with cannon chimney pots on a like for like basis. As discussed, the evidence is that the pre-existing chimney pots were no older than the early part of the 20th Century. We do not consider the works that have taken place to be harmful to the building and there being no expediency in requiring the sourcing of reclaimed early 20th Century chimney pots.

Given that the chimney pots replaced non-original material, while the construction work has been carried out to a high standard, on a like for like basis, and re-using historic material where possible, we consider that the works preserve the significance of the listed building.

#### Rear Pointing

The rear façade has been re-pointed in lime mortar. As you will know, lime mortar is essentially sacrificial and would at some point require repointing due to weathering. Of course once it becomes necessary, repointing is desirable for the ongoing preservation of the building and its performance. The pre-existing character was of worn mortar, some of which appeared to be cementitious in places – the removal of cementitious mortar would plainly be beneficial. In places it had weathered to a depth of the joint width, and in others loose and fragmented. The return to the pre-existing condition would not be desirable in our view. The repointing has been undertaken with an appropriate lime mortar. As set out in our previous correspondence, flush pointing is an appropriate response to the condition of the brickwork. Recessed pointing would be difficult to achieve given the worn bricks, and tuck pointing inappropriate to the character of the building. We therefore consider the pointing to be appropriate and the special interest of the building to be preserved.

#### Conclusion

Overall the works do not affect the primary significance of the building as manifested in its historic and architectural value. In any event, the proposals are appropriate to the listed status of the property.

#### **Closing**

If you have any queries please contact Tim Miles and Timur Tatlioglu in this office at your earliest convenience ([tim.miles@montagu-evans.co.uk](mailto:tim.miles@montagu-evans.co.uk) and [timur.tatlioglu@montagu-evans.co.uk](mailto:timur.tatlioglu@montagu-evans.co.uk)).

Yours sincerely,



MONTAGU EVANS LLP