

There is no design and access statement. In this narrow building, are all the doors including toilet compatible with design for living access?

It is regrettable that the elevations drawings provided do not demonstrate the articulation with No 39 – at present the two extensions are different, and the proposal is to bring No 40 forward. Will it be flush, and a parallel roofline? What materials for the window?



No detail is given about the frontage. The present brick wall, with pillars lacking coping tops, and scaffolding railings is out of character. The conservation statement says (p24) 'traditional iron railings ... should generally be ... reinstated where lost'. It would be welcome for any revision to include rebuilding the boundary, and particularly give attention to the correct style of railing, taking the oldest existing as example.

Also in the conservation area statement: 'the Council will resist ... conversion of front gardens into hard standing areas'. Whilst cycle facility is welcome, there should be care to maintain the other soft area flora character.

It is welcome that there is no proposal to change the roofline. However, the creation of a single bedroom flat and a double bedroom flat is contrary to policies to sustain larger bedroom accommodation, particularly in areas such as central Camden where there is commercial pressure. If you don't keep larger houses, what will happen to the schools?