

Eton

Conservation Area Advisory Committee

Advice from Eton Conservation Area Advisory Committee: 29.01.2017

Re 10 Provost Road: 2016/6486/P, 2016/6595/L

We are responding to the Revised Proposed Plans lodged in respect of the above applications on 26 January 2017.

In our Advice dated 19 December 2016 we objected to three aspects of the application which we consider to be harmful to the Conservation Area:

1. The design and materials proposed for the rear extension
2. The roof of the side extension should not be visible from the street
3. The proposed alteration to the depth of the roof dormers; the resultant projection and harmful intrusion into the street scene.

The revised drawings appear to respond to the third objection above - the proposed alteration to the depth of the roof dormers - since no change to the dimensions of the existing dormers is now proposed. This is to be welcomed.

However, no amendment is proposed to the design and materials of the rear extension or the height of the side extension

Rear extension

In our earlier Advice that we objected to the design and materials proposed for the rear extension because they do not adhere to the guidelines in either the Eton Conservation Area Statement (page 28) or the Camden Planning Guidance - Design (page 29).

This application for a rear extension at No. 10 Provost Road is one of two in Provost Road under consideration by the Council (the other is No 2 Provost Road - 2017/0080/P, 2017/0198/L). It uses as a reference point extensions which have been built in the fairly recent past at Nos. 11 and 12 Provost Road. These are of widely differing designs from each other and from that proposed for No. 10. and in our view neither of these conforms to the guidelines either.

We would like to see a consistent approach by the Council in granting permission to such extensions in the future, which conforms to the guidelines in place.

Our objection still stands. We would like to see something that conforms to the guidelines, something that is "quiet" and unobtrusive, and appropriate to the simplicity of the house.

Side extension

We reiterate our earlier objection to the side extension. The information provided with the application is not clear as to whether the lightweight timber and glass structure which is proposed to replace the perspex roofing and associated timbers on the side extension will be visible from the street.

The existing extension is not visible in views of the front of the building and it is essential that any replacement should be similarly discrete. We consider it is important that the roof of the side extension is not visible from the street - see the Eton Conservation Area Statement: Alterations and Extensions to Existing Buildings (p23).

Eton
CAAC

