

Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

254-256 Camden Road
(Ashton Court)

Date: 15 March 2016

Planning application Reference: 2015/4553/P

Proposal: Reconfiguration, part demolition and extension of care home

Summary: Given the failure to incorporate the CAAC's proposed modifications contained in its submission of 22 September 2015, we do not believe thus recommend that it be rejected.

Comments:

1. In our original comments dated 22 September 2015, the CAAC's approval of the development was conditional on a number of factors. Critically these included
 - 1.1. Limiting the number of new housing units to 4 as originally proposed We argued that in so doing this would
 - improve the minimal space in the layouts and the increased frontage will create the opportunity for more spacious 3 bedroom (as opposed to the 2 bedroom) family houses. It should be noted that the overall design principles established for 5 houses, such as setting back of the second floor from the Camden Mews frontage, are equally adaptable to 4 houses.
 - avoid the need for (increasingly) controversial basements. As is evident from the opposition to the proposed development at 85 Camden Mews, the construction of basements is a major concern for local residents
 - 1.2. Full information on the replacement tree
 - 1.3. Revisions to the roofing materials for the link block fronting Canteloves Road.
 - 1.4. Lack of amenity space and privacy
2. It should also be noted that since the original comments were submitted, basements and three storey developments in the Mews have become major concerns of local residents as well as the wider Camden Square community. In

Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

this particular case the mansarded three storey front would exceed most other partially three storey examples in the Mews, most of which have a shallower front roof pitch.

3. We also have some issues with the drawings themselves
 - 3.1. Section B shows the less contentious portion with the top floor recessed both front and back, but Section A is drawn as if it has the same top floor arrangement
 - 3.2. Section A should show the much less palatable full three storey elevations, albeit with the top floor in a mansard
4. It is also worth recording that the rear elevations which are mostly sheer three storey plus a bit of basement are probably thought not to matter, since the development behind is in the same ownership. However, it is all too easy for these distinctions to be forgotten in the quest for precedents.
5. Sadly the majority of these concerns have not been addressed and we must perforce therefore object to the application. As currently envisaged, the proposal will not enhance the conservation area.



Signed:

David Blagbrough
Chair
Camden Square CAAC

Date: 15 March 2016