## **Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee**

93 Agar Grove London NW1 9UE

Date: 4 July 2017

Planning application Reference: 2017/2686/P

Proposal: Erection of two storey side extension over existing single storey side extension to form a one-bedroom maisonette. Alterations to side entrance gate.

Summary: The proposed development will neither preserve nor enhance the conservation area. It will cause significant overshadowing and reduce lighting levels to adjacent buildings; the materials chosen are either inappropriate or not specified; and most significantly the proposal, as drawn, will not be compliant with building regulations. We therefore object to the proposed development and strongly recommend that it be rejected.

## Comments:

- 1. The drawings are technically inadequate
  - 1.1. The existing and proposed rear elevations are not consistent. They do not clearly show that the proposed extension will significantly block the views from the windows in the side elevation of no.91
- 2. The bulk (height and volume) of the proposal appears inappropriate in relation to neighbouring buildings,
- Due to the proposed material, the windows and their frame and glazing bar profiles will not be a sympathetic match to neighbouring buildings. A slight attempt has been made to differentiate the window heights of the first and second floor windows, which is positive, but could be more pronounced.
- 4. The choice and colour of materials proposed neither make a positive visual contribution nor support historical precedent.
  - 4.1. The choice of aluminium sash windows, as opposed to those in wood, particularly on the front facing elevation, runs counter to the spirit of the Conservation Area Management and Appraisal Strategy and fails to enhance the conservation area.
  - 4.2. The brick work for the proposed extension has not been further specified (apart from the bond), and even though the existing brick

Secretary: Jim Humphris, 88 Agar Grove, NW1 9TL

## **Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee**

work of the main building differs in colour and texture from the brick work of the side elevation, it is not clear which of the two types the new bricks are to match (or if they are to be of another colour altogether).

- The proposed scheme will involve unacceptable levels of overshadowing. The two additional storeys
  - Will block light to and views from the windows of the side elevation of no.91
  - 5.2. Will have a negative impact on the north facing courtyard directly underneath, as well as the neighbouring garden of no.91.
- We have major concerns about the viability of the proposed layout which in our judgement does not comply with current building regulations
  - 6.1. As the top floor of the flat is more than 4.5m above ground level, the internal stair would have to be protected (but is shown in an open plan arrangement on the entrance level);
  - 6.2. The flat is not separated from the common staircase by a protected lobby, even though the common staircase is the single escape route for two flats;
  - 6.3. The internal staircase as shown will exceed the maximum pitch of 42°.
  - 6.4. As the proposed room sizes are already only marginally larger than Carnden's minimum HMO (houses in multiple occupation) standards, it is difficult to see how compliance with the building regulations can be achieved (by introducing the relevant protected lobby, staircase etc.) whilst at the same time maintaining minimum standard room sizes.
  - 6.5. All the windows of the communal staircase will be blocked off. This will have a profound and unacceptable impact on both lighting and ventilation.
- The proposed development will neither preserve nor enhance the conservation area
  - 7.1. The bulk of the building will have a significant and negative impact on its neighbours, especially at its side and rear elevations. Both light and views will be obstructed and there will be considerable over shadowing.
  - 7.2. There is a dearth of information on the choice of materials and where these have been identified, they are problematic.
  - 7.3. Most important, however, is that given the site constraints and the already extremely small room sizes, it will not be possible for the room layouts to be compliant with both building regulations and minimum size standards. In effect therefore, the proposed development is not technically feasible without breaching a number of critical building regulations.
- 8. We therefore object to the proposed scheme.

Secretary:	Jim Humph	ris. 88 Agar	Grove, NV	/1 9TI	
		,	,		

## **Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee**

Date: 5 July 2017



Signed: David Blagbrough Chair Camden Square CAAC