

The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Avon
Bristol BS1 6PN

Tuesday, May 15, 2018

Appeal Case for refused Householder and Listed Building Application, 8 Little Green Street NW5 1BL 2017/481/P and 2017/540/L

We are writing to appeal the refusal for the installation of a mansard roof to 8 Little Green Street, a Grade II listed building, with reference to the Delegated Report for application numbers 2017/4810/P and 2017/540/L.

We have, since the refusal, met with London Borough of Camden (LBC) Planning Officer, Elaine Quigley, and the Conservation Officer, Catherine Bond. It was suggested at the meeting that we should get the roof timbers expertly assessed to ascertain whether they were original, as considerable weight was placed on the 'original' fabric and form of the roof in the Report.

Please see the attached report from Old Times, a company established for more than 20 years in the field of French Polishing and Restoration, both with furniture and building projects and with over 70 years combined experience of working with residential and commercial properties for clients including the Royal Household and Her Majesty's Government. Old Times confirm, in a report enclosed with this submission, that the roof timbers date from the 1960's. The evidence suggests also that the roof form itself is not original, due to the fact that there was originally a large chimney stack emerging from the centre of the roof. Please see our reconstruction drawing of this overlaid with the current roof. It is not possible to know what form the original roof may have taken.

We attach also our email correspondence with Elaine Quigley regarding council delays on the case and voicing our concerns that our application was being inappropriately dealt with. We sought help and support from our local Councillor Jenny Headlam-Wells, the Deputy Mayor of Camden, who intervened on our behalf to request that the application be referred to Members Briefing and Planning Committee for determination. However, the Council, having no requirement to do so under delegated powers, refused.

This afforded us no opportunity to discuss concerns about the consultation period, the redacted date on the single letter of objection that was littered with historical inaccuracies. It was on this basis that we mentioned Flat 6 Grove End House, not because the applications were similar, but because the manner in which the applications were being dealt with was not felt to be equal and we were not afforded any opportunity to defend or discuss our proposals. There was no line of communication, support or help.

It is our assertion that the assessment gives no weight to local views, neighbours who actually live in the street and therefore are most affected by potential change, in favour of the

development, and in this we regret the modesty of our client that he did not actively solicit more to reinforce this view, as others have been want to do.

In addition to the non historic roof material and form, please see that following comments in response to LBC's Assessment, in support of our case:

1. Policy context

Re: Camden Local Plan:

3.2 Policy D1 is aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments and we would like to respectfully draw your attention to our architectural track record, in which we have received RIBA London and Regional Awards, the RIBA South East Conservation Award, and an American Institute of Architects Award for the Best Small Building. We actively strive for the highest standard of architectural and urban design quality in each and every project we undertake.

Re: The Planning (listed building and conservation area) Act 1990

3.3 We are actively engaged by virtue of our proposal in preserving the building, and we believe enhancing the character and appearance of the building within its setting.

3.4 We remain distressed that this selfsame setting has been ridden roughshod over by LBC on so many occasions in recent years, the most recent and painful example when Camden saw fit to concrete the pavement on opposite these listed buildings in a decidedly slipshod manner. The LBC did not support the residents of Little Green Street or to visit the site when they were struggling with the loss of historic fabric, or when the materials of the ghastly and still largely empty Wiblin Mews (completed adjacent to the site in 2017) changed from contextual brick to alien stone cladding and gloomy grey trim and so this decision does sit somewhat uncomfortably with that.

3.6 We would like to draw your attention also to the fact that the long views are not a carefully conserved heritage landscape. Approaching from the north, the building is substantially obscured by the unloved back yard of a housing estate and a mechanic's workshop, with tarmac up to a large railway viaduct, carelessly allowing buddleia to sprout beneath its coping stones, by large trees and a brand new and enormous railway gantry, an overhead support for the new overhead electrification works.

From the east, from the Ingestre Estate, a large protected plane tree obscures the eastern face of the building for most of the year. Even when the tree is bare, the substantial trunk and limbs are far more prominent than the roof of the building. It should be noted also that the eastern façade no longer has its original bricks visible, it has been rendered in a modern render painted white and green, which most likely is rock hard and will damage the bricks were it to be removed.

Whilst it is true that the roof can also be seen from Highgate Road, by virtue of the nature of this road this is more likely to be a brief glimpse between the busses, lorries, railway viaduct, advertising billboards and light industry. Two modern garages and a whole host of modern extensions and conversions to the rear facades and roofs of the building of Little Green Street provide the foreground to this view.

All this notwithstanding, we assert that the mansard roof form proposed is clearly in character for the property and may possibly even be closer to the original form that would have existed with the large central chimney.

The NPPF

3.8 We have taken a number of measures to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal, including the very careful consideration of the internal arrangements, which will recreate the original stair form and reinstate the landing at the top floor. From this will spring a lightweight new timber stair, suspended in the void to clearly delineate itself from the historic fabric, whilst sympathetically responding to it.

3.9 We assert that this proposal preserves and enhances the elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area by virtue of the fact that roof proposal is in keeping with the style of the house and the house. It is worth noting here also that we were recommended to separate out our applications and to submit the roof separately. LBC also confirmed that in town planning terms a mansard roof form would be acceptable. The substantial improvements to the building would create a far more sustainable and environmental family home, fit for purpose for the next hundred years and wholly in character with its surroundings.

We respectfully submit these for your consideration and trust we will be afforded your unbiased support.

Kind regards

Peter Thomas
AA Dipl RIBA FRSA
Director 51 architecture