
From: CAAC Comments Form
Sent: 18 December 2024 13:09
To: Planning; Dawn Allott; Derek Gomez; Tuhinur Khan
Subject: CAAC Consultation Comments Received

Camden Council

Hi,

Someone submitted an entry for the CAAC Comments form form in the Camden Council site. View all the form's entries by clicking [here](#).

[Click here to access the form](#)

Here's what **Someone** entered into the form:

Enter Pin

649041

Application ref.

2024/5413/P

Site Address

Flat 2 29 Steele's Road London NW3 4RE

Development Description

Alteration of existing second floor rear extension's pitched roof to a flat roof, installation of a skylight, and replacement of rear windows; Erection of a rear infill extension at second floor level.

Planning officer

Gary Wong

Advisory committee

Eton

Advisory committee

Please send your comments by:

2025-01-05T00:00:00.000

About your observations

When making your observations please consider the impact the proposals will have on the character and appearance of the conservation area. This will usually be related to physical changes but can include use of buildings. The character and appearance of the conservation area is set out in the conservation area statement it may be useful to refer to it to support your comments.

Please choose one

Objection

Do you have any comments or consider that the proposal is harmful to or does not preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area?

Eton

Conservation Area Advisory Committee

Advice from Eton Conservation Area Advisory Committee: 18.12.2024

Re: Flat 2, 29 Steele's Road: 2024/5413/P

Alteration of existing second floor rear extension's pitched roof to a flat roof, installation of a skylight, and replacement of rear windows; Erection of rear infill extension at second floor level.

This application revises a previous one (2024/4178/P) which was withdrawn.

We objected to the earlier application in the following terms:

"The application describes the infill extension as an 'elegant, distinct' yet 'subordinate' addition to the rear of the house. But the CGI, together with the Longitudinal Section A2.2, show this not to be the case. Both show it to be the most prominent - eye-catching - addition. And the 'deep red' of its structure is definitely a negative contributing factor here.

The window panes of the existing extension are to be realigned so as to be in accordance with the window on the lower floor. But contextual attention such as this is absent where the infill extension is concerned."

In this revised application there are changes to the proposed rear infill extension: the full width window has been reduced to align with the existing doors to the balcony below; the red aluminium cladding has been removed; and the glazing bars to the window are grey.

This revised application proposes a brick infill extension with a flat roof and parapet. In doing so, it follows the same design approach as that proposed for the existing pitched roof extension. But far from creating the effect of a carefully inserted 'missing part of the host building', as the application claims, it produces a heavy-handed, slab like, presence at second floor level. Clearly aiming to be visually quieter than the earlier application, the effect of two flat roofed brick extensions, with yet another window design, crudens the rear elevation of the house: they do not enhance it. Rather they help destroy the quality of the present elevation, which is of additions that have accrued agreeably enough over time.

We repeat our previous concerns. How many extensions, alterations etc can be added to a single elevation in a conservation area before the aim and idea of such areas begins to lose sense? And isn't this point being reached in this case? That this infill extension can't be seen from the road should play no part in any decision, otherwise conservation status begins to amount to little more than a form of facadism.

This revised proposal, like the first, does not enhance the conservation area. It is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) paragraph 203 (f) and should not be approved.

We would also like to repeat the final comment in our objection to the first application. The blocking in of the rear/staircase wall of the infill extension involves the removal of a stained glass window, which is a part of the original Edwardian extension to the house. This raises conservation concerns. No.29, though not a listed building, is listed in the Eton Conservation Area Statement (P.20) under 'Buildings/Structures and Groups of Buildings which make a Positive Contribution' to the special character and appearance of the area. The stained glass window is part of the special character of this building and should be retained as part of any proposed works.

Yours sincerely,
Eton CAAC

Do you want to attach any files?

No

Attach files

To receive a confirmation email, enter your address below:

[Click here to access the form](#)