

## **Heritage Statement**

### **1 Falkland Road, London. Proposed infill side conservatory at ground level.**

#### **The Relevant History:**

The property is a stucco-fronted end of terrace three story (ground to mansard second floor) dwelling house on the north side of Falkland Road, built in the 1830's in the late Georgian era together with the rail line and much of the rest of Kentish Town.

The property was altered in the 1980's by the current owner with a double storey rear extension, providing a modernised kitchen on ground floor and a modernised bathroom on the first floor.

In the early 2000's the current owner added second floor mansard extension to provide an additional bedroom.

In 1985, the property was added to the Kentish Town Conservation Area (Camden Conservation Area Number 19). The description of the conservation area describes the quality of architecture of the stucco-fronted terrace. It describes potential for positive change through incremental reinstatement of quality details, including front gardens and railings. The stretch of Falkland Road extending from the property to the east is well-known for its colourful variation of pastel coloured facades. The street has been used for filming, and is the subject of articles and local history.

The property was originally the west end of the terrace, hence the number 1 Falkland Road. Realignment and development westward to Fortress Road happened in the twentieth century, with a significant change in character on that stretch of the road. This is most apparent with the low quality single story commercial unit directly adjacent to the property on the west, and the detailing and scale of Falkland House and Raleigh House on the west end of Falkland Road, which differs substantially from the original historical terrace.

The currently proposed development site is the small residual land between the property and the single storey commercial unit to the west. This includes a visually intrusive front garden wall in brick and a very large shrub that is encroaching on the street and the property. The proposed extension will consolidate the front garden, improve the coherence of the street frontage, and introduce a high quality, artistic intervention to a currently neglected gap in the urban fabric.

#### **The Proposals:**

The detailed design rationale, both aesthetically and functionally, is set out in the Design and Access Statement.

It involves a set-back glazed infill extension in the gap at the west end of the property. The height is governed by respect to the string course that defines the upper story of the building, and by rights of light considerations to the north neighbour. The front elevation is set back from the main façade to maintain subservience to the primary building, but not so far as to encroach on the historical lintel and architrave details on the west elevation.

The front elevation is glass, screened with intricately patterned metalwork, in keeping with the strong aesthetic character of the street.

#### **The Heritage Impact Assessment:**

The 2008 English Heritage "Conservation Principles" subdivide "heritage value" into four categories:

1) aesthetic, 2) communal, 3) historic, 4) evidential.

Applying those criteria to the proposed works:

1) There is an enhanced aesthetic impact on the existing built form by replacing the dilapidated and closed-off garden wall with a clean iron railing. The removal of the large shrub and the introduction of a finely crafted artistic façade will be an enhancement in comparison to the neglected dark residual space currently existing.

2) There is a minor positive communal impact due to the increased sense of coherence of the front garden and the removal of the dilapidated wall.

3) There is no historic impact. The proposed works do not remove any historical fabric.

4) There is no evidential impact as no works affect any archaeological features, being above ground level.

The 2015 Historic England "Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment" subdivides "heritage asset significance" into four categories:

1) historic, 2) architectural, 3) artistic, 4) archaeological.

Applying those criteria to the proposed works:

1) There is no impact on historic significance.

2) There is a minor impact on architectural significance, with the extension forming an addition to the existing architecture. However, we consider this to be a positive impact, considering the quality of the design and the degraded setting of the existing condition. The position at the end of terrace makes this extension more natural than it would be in a mid-terrace context.

3) There is no impact on artistic significance, as there is no artistic character to the existing residual space.

4) There is no impact on archaeological significance.

**The Planning Policy Assessment:**

These are covered in the Design and Access Statement.

**The Conclusions:**

In conclusion, the proposals comply with the prevailing development plan policies and represent an enhancement to the current condition of the site.