

Comments of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee on 68 Highgate Road NW5 1PA

Planning Application 2018/5514/P - Refuse

Planning Application 2018/5520/L - Refuse

Applicant's Heritage Statement 21 December 2018; Rev 3.0 Note: *italics applicant's references*

OUR COMMENTS/OBJECTIONS

1.0 Introduction

The importance of the first floor accommodation, expressed externally in the front elevation window dimensions and surrounds, the greater ceiling height and the integral function of the rear extension are the principle aspects of the heritage assets requiring the greatest consideration. It is from an acknowledgement of these, that all justifications to proposed or unauthorised works should be based. This has yet to be clearly and succinctly stated and as such, remains the source of potential harm impacting on successive levels of details and alterations referred to throughout the entire statement and proposed application drawings. We include only the main issues here. See also additional notes re drawings below.

1.2 States '*If harm is identified, the statement will identify any required mitigation work.*'

1.4 Schedule of proposed works makes no reference to mitigation work required to timber windows other than to "modify" and refers to other work being in a 'like for like manner' even though materials involved are prohibited for use in Listed Buildings i.e. UPVC as annotated in guttering.

2.0 Site and Surroundings

General comments:

- a) The property boundary is identified on drawings in single line.
- b) Whilst not subject of these applications, the setting of the building - the rear of the building is accessed via a section of College Lane (within the footprint of our DPCA) which has recently been re-laid unauthorised by developers in tarmac, lacking in any quality whatsoever of workmanship or design. The Council have previously been made aware of this; the owner of No 68 HR has every right to expect that the Council reciprocates their expectations of excellence in design by paving this section of College Lane as a continuation of the northern section of the Lane. Harm, awaiting mitigation by the Council. (College Lane remains one continuous public route on either side of Lady Somerset Road which now bisects the historical route).
- c) The drawings of the new eastern boundary wall, part of the curtilage of No 68 HR, lacks information on the like for like description. See drawing comments below.

3.0 Relevant Planning History

General Comments:

No's 68/70 Highgate Road encapsulates an important part of not only the early linear development but the social history of its time. The importance of the first floor as the main living area, as in similar nearby listed buildings of the period, is basic to its plan, internal form and street identity. Rooms can change their named function; however, the expression of the original hierarchy should be rigorously maintained. Pre Existing drawing no P1 03A Ground floor reception layout contradicts 5.14 Statement which claims room dividing double doors existing.

All domestic buildings of this period required outhouse functions including privy/ laundry/ and or coal store. Building listed in Aug 1974. The external space would be the drying area and would likely have been paved and drained; there are many ways of doing this. Likewise, the social arrangements which underlie the meaning of the dwelling, should be maintained, and not lost to overdevelopment with an equivalent loss of external open space. Its footprint should continue to match its twin No 70.

4.0 Historical Development of The Site and Area

General Comment

- a) College Lane and large tracts of the surrounding area were owned by St John's College, Cambridge University, hence the name. Previously the lane was known as Small Coal Alley. This aspect of previous ownership is not mentioned. No harm, but not terribly reassuring, especially since other streets in the immediate vicinity also owe their name to this university connection.
- b) OS maps reproduced are dated 1790, 1835, 1844, 1873 and 1895, whereas the text refers in several locations to the OS map of 1871. Either unchecked, incorrect or both.
- c) Item 4.12 The single-story rear extension, similar on both sides of the semi-detached is not tied to the main building, probably due to the different footings but is almost certainly contemporary with the main house.

5.0 Significance of The Site

5.1 *'A heritage asset is defined as "A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions.'*

- a) Item 5.10 *'The single storey projecting addition to the rear is of no demonstrable significance and due to its painted brickwork, modern fenestration and unsympathetic roofing materials detracts from the setting of the main portion of the listed building.'* Simply incorrect – see items 3 and 4(c) above. The failure to appreciate the importance of this aspect is the potential source of great harm; a reasoned case for demolition and enlargement has not been made.
- b) The single storey south side infill extension with 'corrugated plastic roof,' between Nos 66/68 appears to have gone through several variations in width, length and recently height (incorrectly shown on drawings). There is no reference to an original use. The 2018 OS map drwg P1 01 Location Plan, and drwg P1 02 Site Plan seem to have been unofficially altered, to show full width extension abutting No 66, which it never was. Camden Council's online front sheet for these applications shows on its Location Plan OS 2019 the gap existing between Nos 66/68. All submitted drawings, however, show this infill as full width and as built it will now contain the external down-pipes belonging to the adjacent No 66. All these modifications are not included in the schedule of works. This will cause harm to maintenance of the adjoining property's systems.

6.0 Planning Policy Context

'Policy D2 – Heritage has relevant parts and is clear that: "The Council will preserve and, where appropriate, enhance Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas, listed buildings, archaeological remains, scheduled ancient monuments and historic parks and gardens and locally listed heritage assets.'

Comment

See item 2.0 (b) Site and Surroundings above re-surfacing College Lane.

Item 6.3 (para 189) *'The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance'* – has this been agreed?

– *'Listed Buildings: Listed buildings are designated heritage assets and this section should be read in conjunction with the section above headed 'designated heritage assets'. To preserve or (note this should be **and**) enhance the borough's listed buildings, the Council will':*

j. resist proposals for a change of use or alterations and extensions to a listed building where this would cause harm to the special architectural and historic interest of the building; See item 7.3 below.

7.0 Impact Assessment

Item 7.1 References to the scheduled extent of unauthorised works is welcomed, but much inaccurate in detail. The judgement of the reasons, by the retrospective nature of the submission, are inevitably open to a biased opinion, virtually closing any further comment.

Eg. Inappropriate fenestration secondary glazing could be recommended, handrail “like for like” unclarified, roof light conservation type?

Item 7.3-5 Reasons for demolition of rear extension unsubstantiated – see item 5a above.

Item 7.6 Details of the black Crittal glazing system including, single or double glazed?
This is a major element of the proposals. - Outstanding.

Item 7.9 The re-roofing with slate is welcomed. The phrase *‘with new slate to match that of the neighbouring property at no.70’* requires clarification as to the intention - to match in source, colour, size or all three. See app 2012/3979/L for No 70.

DRAWINGS

Missing: All Drawings should be dated for avoidance of confusion in future reference
Revision box required to describe alterations.

- Drawing No P1 08 - As Built/ elevations and sections
- Drawing No P1 06A - Proposed/elevations and sections

On above drawings:

- raised roof level of south infill extension not shown, importantly see 5.0 (b) above. The side infill originally open at the rear with a mere corrugated roof cover and at garden level. It was not part of the envelope of the dwelling. It has now been enlarged with joists and solid roof.
- 2nd floor window, front elevation - glazing divisions not built as depicted ie 3 over 6 as per original matching No 70, but what is installed is 6 over 6.
- As installed window frames are annotated to be kept and only modified on the Proposed drwg. Window frames are undersized showing solid top panels on rear elevation, historically inaccurate fit into the aperture, and all with too thick a meeting rail.
- Metal railings should be shown inset in coping stone. These should be individual uprights, with finials and a correct historic diameter/thickness and/or square to match adjacent Listed buildings.
- No reference to making good the coping stone on plinth to match original thickness of No 70.
- Rear garden wall to College Lane, the curtilage of the listed building, shows no “pre existing elevation” – clarify ‘to match existing’ brickwork/details.
- Ensure general repair of brickwork to use lime mortar.

Drawing No P1 05A – see objection to enlargement in 3.0 above - appropriateness of green roof questionable as is function of large rooflight (sunlight?).

7.0 Impact Assessment:

page 49 refers to an existing PVCu window at No 70 (Grade II listed) ground floor. Camden’s Enforcement team has already served an enforcement notice for reinstatement to original (EN17/1097).

CONCLUSION

We have included here only the main items posing the greatest threat to the integrity of the building.

These applications should be refused.