

Dear Laura,  
We are writing on behalf of Camden Town CAAC.

**1: Proposed changes internally**

We have no comments on internal changes.

**2: Historical note on this section of Arlington Road** : This section of terrace of 25 houses from 39 to 85\* in Arlington Road was Listed in 1999 .

The Conservation Area containing Arlington Road was created in the 1980's.

(\*The application's DAS notes only part of the terrace)

**3: The rear extension at garden level - history, status as Listed?, effect on amenity & light pollution, objection to new door on design grounds:**

This apparently C20th garden-level rear extension was built despite a refused permission in 1968 (as planning records). Its great length reduces the area for amenity and wildlife in the garden compared with other extensions in the terrace and brings light pollution from its rear doorways nearer to neighbouring buildings than elsewhere in the terrace.

a) If the extension was built after 1999 would its status be "an unconsented addition to a Listed Building"?

b) If the extension was built before 1999 (as seems likely from its appearance (- drainage or Building Regulations records can usually provide a date)) it is part of the Listed building and like other external changes usually needs prior detail drawings before getting permission.

c) Because of light pollution from the end wall we object to the proposed significant increase in actual glazed area and its concentration in one place. A recent permission for a roof-light presumably addresses light levels inside the extension.

d) Whether the extension is Listed or not we object to changing the 2 existing openings to a single, wider opening as being a loss of mid-late C20th design approach and loss of the existing design's use of 'vertical-emphasis' openings to relate to openings in the main building.

**4: The glasshouse at upper level (above garden level) - status as Listed and as Conservatory, Building Control safety regulations, Overlooking**

**Status:** The glasshouse appears to have been erected without any permissions. If erected after 1999 (as is possible from its style) it does not have Listed Building Consent and may require this retrospectively?

a) **Building Type / Use Description of the glasshouse;** it is not correct to classify the present glasshouse as a "conservatory" because its past use has been as a greenhouse/ outhouse and it has not been an inhabited or habitable space (please refer to CAAC residents on this). We understand that in planning terms it does not qualify as a 'Permitted Development' Conservatory.

b) **Building Regulations –Existing Situation Access, Falling, Construction:**  
**Access:** access to the glasshouse from the staircase does not satisfy Building Regulations (Staircase Safety).

**Falling1:** Access to the roof beyond the glasshouse would be dangerous (risk of falls from unfenced roof). (Should the risk be removed? B.Reg/Council insurance.)

**Falling2:** Are the glass walls of the glasshouse a risk if they break if fallen on and result in a fall to the lower levels on either side? *(Should the risk be removed? B.Reggs/Council insurance.)*

**Construction:** Are the glass walls/panes a risk of breaking and injuring persons on lower levels on either side?. *(Should the risk be removed? B.Reggs/Council insurance.)*

c) **Overlooking:** the existing glasshouse overlooks the adjacent property which is contrary to planning policy, the Local Plan and previous planning decisions..

**5: The glasshouse's effect on features in Conservation Area, effect on group character of the rear elevation of Listed Terrace, previous applications refused.:**

- a) The Conservation Area Appraisal notes that the view of this rear elevation of this terrace is important and should be retained. We note that the views along the terrace and the views straight at it from Albert Street's houses (all Listed) show the terrace's unusual and wide and "ground to roof" brick chimney flues and the houses' unusual roofs. To permit construction / reconstruction of any sort of building on this Upper level would harm the continuity of these views of the terrace and harm No41's Listed character.
- b) Over recent years planning permission for construction at this level has been consistently refused.
- c) We object to any construction at this upper level harming the Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area. We object to any risk of such construction creating a precedent.
- d) **We understand that a current application at No85 is being processed.**

**6: Rear elevation replacement windows:**

- a) We have no objection to the joinery proposals and look forward to detail drawings of the window joinery.

**7: Tree Report, Fire Pit:**

- a) **We have not been able to get a tree surgeon's view on the tree report.** Our first impression of the report is it seems thinner on detail than some reports we have seen and we recommend a Council Tree Officer's inspection.
- b) **If the Works to Trees was advertised on the Ward by Ward notification emails as normally happens, instead of (or as well as) being within a planning application, we think there would be wider consultation which would benefit the trees, wildlife and green corridors that exist in gardens between the terraces.**
- c) Fire Pit: Bearing in mind that it could create a precedent for other fire pits resulting in severe harm to the wildlife in the green corridor formed by the back gardens, we object very strongly to this idea.

Yours sincerely

Gordon Macqueen

Margaret Richardson and Gordon Macqueen, Co-chairs Camden town CAAC