



Anton Bielecki



Feedback for listed building consent HGY/2022/2546

Anton Bielecki

15 March 2023 at 17:02

To: thomas.muston@



Hi Thomas, I spoke to your colleague, Tim Murphy on the phone yesterday and he said to reach out to you via email. I spoke to you back in January concerning my **Listed Building Consent application HGY/2022/2546**, which was unfortunately denied. When we chatted you very kindly offered to answer any brief follow up questions I may have concerning our re-application, so I've laid out my couple of questions below.

Per your advice, I've had a CARE accredited engineer conduct an assessment of my proposed plans, and he has concluded that they can be implemented without structural harm or significant loss or damage to the historic fabric of the property. My questions are:

- Instead of installing conservation rooflights in the proposed family bathroom, we would like to extend the dormer window from the rear bedroom into the bathroom. Can we do this?

- We would like to remove the ceiling finishes, and alternate ceiling joists, in only the proposed sitting room and principal bedroom. The CARE engineer has concluded that the ceiling joists are modern and that by removing alternate ceiling joists we would not cause any structural problems. Can we do this?

I've attached your previous advice to more easily help you locate the case. If you wish to see any more documentation don't hesitate to reach out. I just wanted to be as brief as possible so as to not waste your time!

Hope to hear from you soon.

All the best,
Anton Gallegos Bielecki

**32_34 Highgate High Street_Conservation Officer Report.pdf**

127K



Anton Bielecki



Feedback for listed building consent HGY/2022/2546

Thomas Muston - Built Heritage Consultant <Thomas.Muston@placeservices.co.uk>

16 March 2023 at 04:48

To: Anton Bielecki



Hi Anton,

Thank you for your email.

To answer your first question this would depend on two things, can this be done without harm to the structure (is there a timber stud)? How will this look upon the elevation?

The best case being that this would have no impact upon the historic timber frame and would fit comfortably upon the rear elevation, leading to no harm to the significance of the listed building. Were there to be the potential loss of historic fabric such as a timber stud then this would result in harm to significance, Paragraph 202 of the NPPF being relevant.

For the second question, as the CARE Engineer has instructed that the fabric impacted by the proposals is modern then there would be no harm to fabric of significance which is a positive. The only thing that would be useful to know is if the existing ceiling height is historically correct? If so, then vaulting the ceiling will be challenging.

Kind Regards

Thomas

Thomas Muston BA (Hons) MSc

Built Heritage Consultant

Tel:

Mob:

email:

web: www.placeservices.co.uk



Anton Bielecki



Feedback for listed building consent HGY/2022/2546

Anton Bielecki

16 March 2023 at 08:36

To: Thomas Muston - Built Heritage Consultant



Hi Thomas, thanks very much for your reply. I've responded to your queries below in red.

To answer your first question this would depend on two things, can this be done without harm to the structure (is there a timber stud)? How will this look upon the elevation?

The best case being that this would have no impact upon the historic timber frame and would fit comfortably upon the rear elevation, leading to no harm to the significance of the listed building. Were there to be the potential loss of historic fabric such as a timber stud then this would result in harm to significance, Paragraph 202 of the NPPF being relevant.

Here's a quote from the CARE Engineer on the dormer window:

"The mansard roof is of timber construction dating from the 19th century and contemporary with the common rafters. The timber has some historic significance. The quality of construction and the condition of the timber is generally good and amenable to careful minor alterations. To widen the dormer window would require the curtailment of one timber which would then be trimmed, ideally by re-using the removed portions of the historic timber so as to maximise the retention of all fabric for a similar purpose near its original location."

I've also attached a plan of the existing and proposed external elevation, showing the proposed extension of the dormer window, which will match the existing dormer window.

 **04A_Existing and Proposed External Elevations.pdf**

Furthermore, in relation to NPPF Paragraph 202, this will lead to less than substantial harm and has public benefits. The extension of the dormer window will create a more symmetrical look on the external elevation of the flat. It will also provide natural light and air flow into the bathroom, which currently has no windows. My proposal is in keeping with the historic fabric, while adapting the flat to the current needs of me and my family. Although we would re-use the timber, another solution is to fit a couple of small casement windows between the timbers, but this would not mirror the existing double casement in the kitchen (as seen in the external elevation plans). What do you think?

For the second question, as the CARE Engineer has instructed that the fabric impacted by the proposals is modern then there would be no harm to fabric of significance which is a positive. The only thing that would be useful to know is if the existing ceiling height is historically correct? If so, then vaulting the ceiling will be challenging.

So the ceiling was raised in 1987 by 400mm (as seen in the 1987 plans in the previous application), so is not historically correct. We've also had the CARE engineer confirm that. Would we then be able to remove the

ceiling finishes and alternate joists? The CARE engineer has also confirmed that this does not have any structural implications for the roof.

Again, thanks so much for your time!

Best,
Anton Gallegos Bielecki



[Quoted text hidden]



04A_Existing and Proposed External Elevations.pdf

20777K



Anton Bielecki

Feedback for listed building consent HGY/2022/2546

Thomas Muston - Built Heritage Consultant

To: Anton Bielecki

16 March 2023 at 10:18

Hi Anton,

Thanks for the swift reply and for providing more detailed comments from the CARE Engineer.

As the Engineer has identified that to widen the dormer would result in the loss of some historic fabric (c.19th rafter) this would result in a low level of less than substantial harm (Para.202). You are right to point out that Paragraph 202 states that any harm should be weighed against public benefits, this is typically the Case Officer who does this balancing. However, in my experience there is little public benefit from such works as this is a private residence. Whilst the introduction of a casement window between the rafters would overcome the above concern of fabric loss, I would think this has the potential to appear an awkward addition next to the dormer being similar in principle to the refused application.

In some cases, where there is harm this can be balanced against the heritage benefits or improvements of the proposals such as replacing poor modern windows for better traditionally detailed ones. It might be worth exploring if you have such an opportunity?

Regarding the proposed works to the modern ceiling/modern joists, the CARE Engineer has confirmed that the fabric itself is of no contribution to the significance of the building thus there is no objection to its removal. Thus, there would be no harm from removing alternate joists and modern ceiling finishes as proposed, so would not be objectionable.

Going forwards for any future resubmission, it is important to clearly identify that the building has been altered in the 1980's and that this fabric is of no contribution to the listed buildings significance. Hopefully the CARE Engineer can help with this by supplying a detailed report against the proposals, this is particularly important for the structural implications.

[Quoted text hidden]



Anton Bielecki



Feedback for listed building consent HGY/2022/2546

Anton Bielecki



16 March 2023 at 12:22

To: Thomas Muston - Built Heritage Consultant



Thank YOU for the swift reply! So perhaps a compromise on the dormer window would be to keep the historic timber in the gambrel (angled) and build the dormer in front of it (vertical), leaving the historical timber in situ, untouched. This would create an interesting historical reference internally, and would create a dormer window to match the one on the kitchen side, which is the best elevation. Also further to NPPF Paragraph 202, this would not affect any historical fabric, while also securing the "optimum viable use" of the bathroom, which is in much need of light and fresh air. What do you think?

Anton Gallegos Bielecki



[Quoted text hidden]



Anton Bielecki

Feedback for listed building consent HGY/2022/2546

Thomas Muston - Built Heritage Consultant

To: Anton Bielecki

21 March 2023 at 07:39

Hi Anton,

Yes, not impacting historic fabric would be a positive. A section drawing would be required to show the changes, also for a fully informed decision a full elevation drawing in addition to this. As I understand it, it would essentially mirror the existing dormer.

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

Furthermore, in relation to NPPF Paragraph 202, this will lead to less than substantial harm and has public benefits. The extension of the dormer window will create a more symmetrical look on the external elevation of the flat. It will also provide natural light and air flow into the bathroom, which currently has no windows. My proposal is in keeping with the historic fabric, while adapting the flat to the current needs of me and my family. Although we would re-use the timber, another solution is to fit a couple of small casement windows between the timbers, but this would not mirror the existing double casement in the kitchen (as seen in the external elevation plans). What do you think?

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]



Anton Bielecki



Feedback for listed building consent HGY/2022/2546

Anton Bielecki

21 March 2023 at 19:44

To: Thomas Muston - Built Heritage Consultant



Great to know, thank you! And finally (last question I promise), I wish to put a doorway in the masonry wall between the proposed Living Room and a proposed adjoining "Closet" (after some research, I'm using a Georgian term for the space). I've attached the proposed floorplan so you can see what I mean. The door will go in an area of the wall where a fireplace was removed in 1987. The CARE engineer has inspected that area and concluded the following:

"The exposed masonry comprises a mixture of 20th century bricks at the lower part of the wall overlaid by re-used late-18th or early-19th century bricks topped by aerated concrete blocks, all laid in strong and stiff cementitious mortar. A mass concrete padstone supporting the bearings of the steel beams supporting the roof is located to one side of the proposed door opening. Aside from the small area of re-used older brickwork all the masonry at the proposed doorway dates from the modern era and has no historic significance. To form the new doorway the masonry above will be temporarily propped and a new precast prestressed concrete lintel installed which will bear on the remaining masonry on each side. A small portion of the existing mass concrete padstone will be carefully cut back but this will have no negative consequences on the ability of the remainder to function satisfactorily."

I figure this is fine, given this context, but just want to check with you; are we able to create this doorway?

Anton Gallegos Bielecki



[Quoted text hidden]

**02B_Proposed Layout.pdf**

21854K



Anton Bielecki

Feedback for listed building consent HGY/2022/2546

Thomas Muston - Built Heritage Consultant

To: Anton Bielecki

22 March 2023 at 05:56

Hi Anton,

Yes, as it has been evidenced that the wall is not comprised of historic fabric there is no in principle objection to a new doorway. I would recommend that for the 'closet' and new bathroom that these are squared-off stud partitions rather than curved as this would be more in keeping to the period of the property.

[Quoted text hidden]



Anton Bielecki



Feedback for listed building consent HGY/2022/2546

Anton Bielecki



22 March 2023 at 06:14

To: Thomas Muston - Built Heritage Consultant



Ok great, well thank you so much for taking the time to answer my queries, I really appreciate it!

[Quoted text hidden]

--

[Quoted text hidden]