

## **Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee**

**31 Agar Grove  
London**

**Date: 24 August 2023**

**Planning application Reference: 2023/2961/P**

**Proposal:** Erection of a ground floor rear extension with two sets of French doors and conversion of a 3-bedroom duplex flat to 1x3 bed flat at ground floor and 1x studio flat at first floor

**Summary:** We strongly object to this proposal and recommend that it be rejected. It fails either to maintain or enhance the conservation area. The drawings are inadequate, the bulk is inappropriate in relation to neighbouring buildings, the loss of rear garden space is significant, the technical viability of the internal layout is questionable, and the proposal totally disregards the form of the host building

### **Comments:**

1. Whilst the drawings are adequate, no Design Access Statement (DAS) has been submitted. Essential information is missing. The proposal and materials are therefore not fully explained. In a conservation area and for this type of development, a DAS is a requirement. It is surprising that the application was validated.
2. The bulk of the development is inappropriate in relation to the neighbouring buildings.
  - 2.1. The host building has already been extended at lower ground floor level. The proposal extends this further to a total distance of almost 6m from the rear elevation and leaves a disproportionately small garden area remaining. The proposal reduces this garden area by 35%
  - 2.2. The neighbouring buildings have not been shown on the proposal plans, and therefore it is difficult to ascertain how this excessive depth will affect them.
3. It is impossible to assess the choice of materials.
  - 3.1. They are not described on the drawings and no DAS submitted

## **Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee**

4. It is not possible to assess whether acceptable levels of light and direct sun are maintained
  - 4.1. Neighbouring buildings are not shown on the application drawings. It is therefore assumed that these have not been assessed by the developer.
5. It is not possible to assess whether the proposed landscaping maintain or enhances the conservation area
  - 5.1. No landscaping details for the (small) remaining garden area have been submitted.
  - 5.2. That being said, it would appear that there would be a 35% loss of rear garden space as a result of this proposed development
6. This proposal seeks to shoehorn in two flats into what is currently 1 x 3 bed flat.
  - 6.1. The developer may claim that the scheme satisfies a need for small units in the area, however in order to do this every single internal wall of the host building is shown as being removed and the space subdivided in an unsympathetic way.
7. The proposal totally disregards the historic plan form of the host building and is driven purely by the desire to cram as many units into the building fabric as possible.
8. We have concerns about the technical viability of the internal layout
  - 8.1. The proposal completely disregards the form of the building.
  - 8.2. No indication of support for the upper floors is shown (i.e. the necessary piers to party walls to support the structural steelwork required).
  - 8.3. The drawings demonstrate an ignorance of the structural implications of the proposal.
9. This scheme fails to maintain or enhance the conservation area and should be rejected
  - 9.1. It demonstrates a complete disregard for the form of the host building and represents overdevelopment of the site by means of further extending and completely decimating the interior by indiscriminate removal of all the walls..
  - 9.2. The upper levels of the building (not part of the proposal) are shown as HMO (C4 use class) and this proposal seeks to put the raised ground floor accommodation into further studio flat accommodation,

## **Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee**

and place the three bedroom accommodation into highly compromised spaces in the lower ground floor.

- 9.3. The cover letter described this as a response to a recent Appeal refusal due to the loss of the 3 bed unit. The proposal to place the 3 bed unit entirely at lower ground floor level into a highly compromised space does not represent a like for like replacement of the lost original 3 bed unit.

**Signed:**

David Blagbrough  
Chair  
Camden Square CAAC

**Date: 24 August 2023**