

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/4358/P	Camden Town CAAC	12/11/2021 15:20:39	COMMNT	<p>It is the Committee's view that a mansard addition to this house is acceptable in principle, in view of its context: namely that all the other houses on this side of Albert Street already have mansards added (apart from the immediate neighbour to the south which yet to undergo any refurbishment). Unfortunately the form of mansard that it is proposed to replicate, that of 127 to the north, is not a good example to follow at the front, as it does not comply with Camden's guidance for pitch, nor for height at the eaves. A more appropriate example would be the form of that on 129/131 Albert Street which is a true double pitched mansard and therefore could offer interesting spatial possibilities to the interior - this mansard sits particularly well on the three storey building below and enhances the simplicity of its front facade (which unlike most of the houses on the street does not have stucco architraves to the windows, brackets and other decorative features). Alternatively following Camden's standard mansard guidance would be acceptable.</p> <p>In addition we would like the following comments to be taken into account (as per the parallel application without a mansard):</p> <p>With full refurbishment required we would expect to see suitable upgrading of the building fabric to comply with sustainability needs and the climate emergency, sensitively addressing improvements to insulation, and to thermal conductivity of windows through the use of secondary glazing on traditional sashes and double glazing on modern windows, along with an assessment of its suitability for alternative energy sources. Historic England has good technical guidance on retrofitting for Listed buildings and we urge the applicants to follow this.</p> <p>We are concerned that a conservation engineering report has not been submitted, in view of the movement apparent in the front facade. This should be conditioned to ensure that any structural work proposed is appropriate. In particular underpinning of the front facade of 125 alone may cause differential movement within the party walls and to neighbouring facades, and the Committee notes that 123 is also showing similar signs of distress. Establishing the correct cause and instituting sympathetic repairs in appropriate materials is imperative.</p> <p>As the stucco to the ground floor is composed of roman cement, which is breathable if coated in mineral silicate paint, repairs should be made in matching roman cement and not in ordinary portland cement. Without a front area and basement, improving the breathability of the stucco will also diminish the possibility of damp affecting the ground floor of the house internally.</p> <p>We note that whilst some of the sashes to the front are later replacements, being horned, they have very finely dimensioned glazing bars. The Committee would therefore wish encourage their retention and repair which would be more sustainable than wholesale replacement, in view of the pre-app. requirement to have single glazing here. If historic glass is not present then new glass with a Low Emissivity coating could be specified to improve thermal performance, along with slimline secondary glazing located on the staff beads.</p> <p>The proposed cleaning of the brickwork cannot be supported as the face of the bricks have already been deeply scoured in removing the paint that previously covered the facade. Further cleaning of their surface will make them more absorbent and prone to failure. The inappropriate non-original cement pointing should, however, be carefully raked out and replaced with lime - this is especially important in view of the porous state of the bricks as a hard cement will lead to faster deterioration of the bricks.</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

The proposed rear extension is considered appropriately scaled and designed but the Committee has misgivings about the oversized roof light, as that will cause considerable light pollution in the rear garden area, allowing light to shine up onto the rear facade. This is especially the case given that this is to be a kitchen which tend to be brightly lit and much used in the evenings.
