

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 June 2019 12:10  
**To:** Hope, Obote  
**Subject:** 2019/1892/L 125 Arlington Road

Hi Obote,

Thank you for consulting me on the above application. Below are my conservation obs.

125 Arlington Road forms part of a terrace of 23 houses, listed at grade II and dating from the 1840s, with stock brick and rendered ground floor and basement. The properties are located in the Camden Town Conservation Area.

**The proposals**

The application comprises full width basement extension, part-width ground floor extension, internal alterations, replacement of front steps to basement, and opening up of existing basement entrance.

**Rear extension**

The proposed extension appears visually over-bearing and dominant on the rear elevation, and its scale, siting, design, and visibility undermine the significance of the rear elevation.

The Camden Town Conservation Area Appraisal (2007) states 'The original historic pattern of rear elevations within a street or group of buildings is an integral part of the character of the area and as such rear extensions will not be acceptable where they would compromise the special character.'

An extension at basement level could be acceptable on the host building, provided it reads as a subordinate addition. However, at ground floor, an extension would not be an acceptable addition because characteristic features would be lost or obscured and historic fabric would be removed, and the vertical emphasis of the rear elevation undermined. The proposed depth of the basement extension is disproportionately large and needs to be pulled in.

Furthermore, the proposed extent of glazing will detract from the character and appearance of the listed building. Any new extension would need to be sympathetic to the established character (and solid to void ratio). Also, it is considered the dining area will likely be a highly lit occupied living space, which would further detract from the character and appearance of the listed building.

It is noted there are an assortment of rear extensions to the properties within the listed terrace. However, the group was only listed in 1999, and the extensions noted in the Design & Access Statement (No. 103, 109, 121, 125, and 135) precede the listing.

The proposed steel screening, bridge and balustrade are unsympathetic and jarring additions.

**Internal Works**

The proposed internal alterations are significant changes, contrary to the description of the works on the Application Form. Many of the proposed works are considered to be harmful to the special interest of the listed building, including the loss of original, historic or characteristic features. The enlargement of the opening in the chimney breast is also out of character, and the internal boxing of the SVP which would involve a reasonable loss of fabric, and alter plan form. The glazed screens and internal partitions would not respect or restore the original plan form. The subdivision at basement is excessive, and the kitchenette eats in to the staircase, undermining plan form.

Furthermore, the relocation of the kitchen from the basement to a principal floor in a principal room (ground floor, front) is a major intervention to a listed building. It could be acceptable, however, the significance of existing fabric

(floor, ceiling and wall) needs to be established, and the impact of the proposed works on that significance explained. Additionally, the impact of the associated services need to be provided.

**External works (excluding the rear extension)**

Although the proposed replacement of non-original stone steps in the lightwell would not impact on historic fabric, the proposed steel steps would be out of keeping and harmful to the strong cohesive character of the terrace and the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The opening up of the vault is acceptable in principle, but the tanking or hard render is not appropriate. A more sympathetic approach would need to be considered.

**Structural works**

With reference to the proposed underpinning, joint reinforcement of external brickwork, and internal floor levelling, justification for these proposals needs to be provided.

**Heritage benefits**

There are some heritage benefits to the scheme, however these do not outweigh the harm. These benefits include:

- At basement level: The removal of the false arch in chimney breast; the blocking up of the non-original window opening in the rear elevation.

I hope the above is helpful and clear.

Regards,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Planner (Conservation)  
Supporting Communities  
London Borough of Camden

[Redacted]

Web: [camden.gov.uk](http://camden.gov.uk)

5 Pancras Square  
London N1C 4AG

Please consider the environment before printing this email.