
From:
Sent: 05 February 2025 19:38
To: Adam Greenhalgh
Cc: Planning
Subject: 170 Camden Road Ref 2024/5813/P
Attachments: Comments to the Council on 170 Camden Road 1 February 2025.docx

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc.

Dear Adam

I am attaching our comments on the above-mentioned planning application

Best wishes

David

David Blagbrough
Chair
Camden Square CAAC

Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

170 Camden Road

Date: 1 February 2025

Planning application Reference: 2024/5813/P

Proposal: Alterations including: re-cladding two storey rear extension and formation of rear spiral staircase thereto, re-building retaining wall to front lightwell, formation of tall window in side elevation, formation of bi-fold doors and terrace to existing rear dormer, extension and re-cladding of side dormer and alterations to fenestration and re-cladding of front dormer

Summary: This proposal has numerous positive aspects. However, our support for this application would be conditional on the provision of additional information and more convincing window drawings

Comments:

1. Although the drawings are thorough and the concepts clearly presented, very little information is given about external finishes and colours, which are a basic requirement for all planning applications.
 - 1.1. The application form only mentions the charred timber slats over insulation proposed for the rear extension.
 - 1.2. The Design and Access statement refers to anthracite zinc cladding to dormers.
 - 1.3. Window materials and colours appear not to be stated.
 - 1.4. In the drawings, the colour of the painted metal rear railings and stairs is not mentioned.
2. In terms of scale and proportion of the proposed development
 - 2.1. Enlargement of the mean-looking side dormer appears appropriate externally as well as improving the internal layout.
 - 2.2. Redesign of the badly-proportioned non-original windows in the rear is a great improvement, but information is needed about framing material and colour.
 - 2.3. The extremely thin lines of framing look schematic rather than plausible for even the slimmest steel bi-fold doors. Slim aluminium frames would be thicker still. Assuming the frames are to be metal, the type of metal must be stated to give any confidence that the built work might resemble the rather idealised drawing.

Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

3. In our view, the proposed charred timber cladding to the rear extension would feel coarse in the context rather than providing a sensitive contrast to the brickwork elsewhere. Although it would hardly be a design feature, a rendered finish to external insulation would be a more sensitive alternative. The proposed anthracite zinc would be appropriate for the revised dormer cladding, but what appears to be its application in thin strips would again make too strong a statement in the context.
4. Protection of privacy to neighbours is difficult to judge as no photos appear to have been submitted, and Google Earth offers limited help.
 - 4.1. The recessed rear roof terrace would be acceptable in design terms, but its relationship to the house in Camden Mews behind is hard to evaluate.
 - 4.2. In some roads, Camden seems to have a policy of requiring a certain distance from houses behind inset roof terraces.
 - 4.3. The proposed upper ground floor rear balcony and stair, and the tall slot window in the flank wall (minimal frame type not mentioned) may reduce privacy to No. 172, but this can't be properly judged without photos.
5. Despite its numerous positive aspects, we cannot properly consider this application until adequate information and more convincing window drawings are produced.
 - 5.1. Photos are needed to judge overlooking.
 - 5.2. Amongst the beneficial changes are enlarging the front and rear lightwells and vastly improving some ill-proportioned fenestration. The apparently steel-framed windows could in our view be elegant and enhance the conservation area although Camden may require that some are painted timber.
 - 5.3. Our main design concern is with the unsympathetic finish for the rear extension and apparently strong profiling of the dormer cladding, which we consider would harm the Conservation Area.

Subject to these issues being addressed, we would support this application.

Signed:
David Blagbrough,
Chair, Camden Square CAAC

Date: 1 February 2025