

From:
Sent: 25 February 2025 20:08
To: Blythe Smith
Cc: Planning
Subject: 2 Camden Park Road Ref 2025/0141/P
Attachments: Comments to Council 2 Camden Park Road 25 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 Blythe

I am attaching our comments on the above application. You will note that though the scheme has been reduced and is more appropriate, there are still problems with the design and buildability, and should therefore be rejected.

Best wishes

David

David Blagbrough

Chair
Camden Square CAAC

Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

2 Camden Park Road

Date: 25 February 2025

Planning application Reference: 2025/0141/P

Proposal: The construction of a single storey side infill extension.

Summary: Due to the awkward shape of the proposed roof and the resulting, so far unresolved problems, in its current form the development neither maintains nor enhances the Conservation Area and should therefore be rejected

Comments:

1. This application replaces two previous applications, 2024/4542/P and 2024/4540/P, proposing a significantly reduced scope of works. The application site is now shown in context with its neighbouring building and has omitted the previously proposed air conditioning unit, which would have made a noise impact assessment and thermal modelling necessary. However, concerns remain
 - 1.1. the section through the proposed rear extension is extremely rudimentary and unresolved in detail
 - 1.2. important information on the proposed materials is missing from the drawings (although mentioned in the application form).
2. Part of the NE section of the new extension roof is shown at a 45 degree angle, whereas the rest of the roof is shown flat. Whilst this is clearly designed in order to minimise overshadowing of the neighbouring garden, this results in a very awkward and unresolved shape, with the gutter solution remaining unclear.
3. In the application form, the new replacement rear window has been described to be hardwood, with double glazing, but no colour has been specified. The new sliding doors are described to be powder coated, triple glazed slimline aluminium units. These materials are appropriate, but should also be more clearly labelled on the application drawings.
4. The rather complicated new roof, which has flat and sloping parts, as well as a gutter that is only schematically shown on plan but not in section, is likely to be prone to problems, and more details would be required to judge how the critical junctions work, especially the gutter solution on the party wall line.

Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

5. The roof of the new extension is shown partly at a 45 degree angle, which should avoid overshadowing, but results in an awkward shape, as pointed out under 2B.
6. The drawings are very rudimentary and schematic, showing a largely unresolved solution for the roof of the new rear extension. To be considered a positive contribution to the Conservation Area, more details explaining how the gutter on the party wall line and the junctions between sloping and flat parts work would be required.
7. The scope of this application has been considerably reduced compared with the previous, withdrawn applications. The size of the proposed extension itself as well as the chosen materials would be acceptable, but because of the awkward shape of the proposed roof and the resulting, so far unresolved problems, it cannot be seen as making a positive contribution to the Conservation Area and should therefore be rejected in its current form.

Signed:

David Blagbrough
Chair
Camden Square CAAC

Date: 25 February 2025