

Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

13 At Augustine's Road
London
NW1

Date: 16 November 2017

Planning application Reference: 2017/5311/P

Proposal: A retrospective application for alterations to existing of three piers and addition of two new piers; creation of a low level boundary wall with metal railings atop, new metal gates, re-landscaping of the front garden including the addition of a cycle and in store, all in connection with residential units

Summary: The development fails to enhance the conservation area and in keeping with the requirements of the Camden Square CAAC Management Strategy the enforcement notice should be implemented with the reinstatement of the original boundary wall, stone screen and gate.

Comments:

1. We note that the works that have been carried out to the boundary wall differ significantly from the scheme outlined in 2013/5715/P and approved on 4 February 2014. An enforcement notice has been issued by the council and this application is seeking retrospective planning permission. This is in line with the Camden Square CAAC Management Strategy which states that
 - 1.1. "Where boundary walls or railings have been lost or replaced in non-original materials or to a different design we encourage residents to restore them to the original form (para 7.7.4)
 - 1.2. "The council will resist the loss of soft landscaping and original boundary walls and railings". It will also resist "increasing the height and density of front boundaries" (para 8.0
2. The drawings are technically inadequate. They do not
 - 2.1. include an accurate side elevation of the new cycle and bin store (which is a major feature of this development),
 - 2.2. specify the materials to be used

Secretary: Jim Humphris, 88 Agar Grove, NW1 9TL Tel: [REDACTED]

Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

- 2.3. show adjacent buildings, which is important when endeavouring to review the works in context
3. The height and number of the new piers, as well as the size of the combined cycle and bin store - which stretches over the whole depth of the front garden - are out of proportion compared with the two neighbouring buildings.
4. A great proportion of the front garden and boundary wall is taken up by the overly high and massive piers and bin/cycle store which visually subdivide the front garden into long, narrow strips. The applicant's planning statement argues that this is a positive feature of the development in that the double entrance "affords both privacy and security for the future residents of each of the two units". What the applicant fails to acknowledge, however, is that the development fails to relate to neighbouring buildings and indeed is totally antagonistic to the original and prevailing design of the garden entrances and boundary walls of the relatively grand semi-detached houses in the rest of the street.
5. The development fails to support the rhythm of neighbouring buildings
 - 5.1. The subdivision of the boundary wall into two gates of similar size and a largely reduced section for the front garden, intersected by oversized single and double piers, are contrary to the generous and open character of the houses and front areas of this area.
 - 5.2. The addition of the bicycle/bin store forms a further significant disruption
6. The choice of materials does not support historical precedent
 - 6.1. The use of wrought iron railings is unfortunate and presents a missed opportunity to reinstate pierced cast stone screens over low brick walls, like those at nos 46 and 48, that are typical for this area.
7. No information is given about the materials used for the cycle and bin storage or their durability
8. The style of the development fails to enhance – indeed diminishes -the conservation area
 - 8.1. The faux Georgian style of the wrought iron railings is completely inappropriate for this early to mid-Victorian development and clashes with the existing upper ground floor balcony railings.
9. This is another example where the insensitive treatment of the front garden and boundary wall has not enhanced or preserved the Conservation Area, but added another alienating element into an already random assortment of boundary treatments.
10. Whereas the approved drawings showed a by no means ideal solution, the built version is far more obtrusive and disruptive. It is a chance missed to reinstate

Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

some of the original features that had been typical for the area and are now only preserved in a few properties on this road, or to come up with a striking contemporary solution that would complement the style and proportion of the building.

11. The development fails to enhance the conservation area and should be rejected. Enforcement procedures should therefore be implemented and in line with its Camden Square CAAC management strategy "action should be taken by the Council to recover details which have been damaged, modified or removed without planning permission"



Signed:
David Blagbrough
Chair
Camden Square CAAC

Date: 16 November 2017