

Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

74 St Augustine's Road
London, NW1 9RP

Date: 15 January 2020

Planning application Reference: 2019/5316/P

Proposal: Erection of full width single storey rear extension at lower ground floor, half width two storey rear extension at upper ground floor, upper ground floor terrace with associated garden access stairs and alterations to the existing dormer at main roof level. Conversion from two flats to a single family dwelling.

Summary: The application is characterised by inadequate drawings and lack of detail. In its present form it fails to maintain or enhance the conservation area and should be rejected

Comments:

1. We have issues with the technical adequacy of the drawings
 - 1.1. The existing roofline, as viewed from St Augustine's Rd, is not as the submitted drawings. There is a visual vertical step up, circa 300mm above the original roof ridge that is not shown in the section drawings.
 - 1.2. While photographs of rear elevations have been provided, drawings for the adjacent rear elevations of nos 72 and 76 should be provided to better illustrate the proposals in their fullest context.
 - 1.3. It appears that the proposed full width rear extension is to be used as a kitchen although this additional room space is not identified as such. Additional notation required.
 - 1.4. The application, in part, seeks permission for conversion from two flats to a single-family dwelling. It appears from the proposed application drawings, however, that, while a stair has been added up to ground floor, it would still be very possible for the lower ground floor to be used as a self-contained flat. Clarification should be sought as to proposed future use.
 - 1.5. No details for materials to be used in the lower ground and ground floor rear extensions are included on the drawings. Revised drawings therefore necessary.



Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

- 1.6. The same information is required for the cladding of the existing dormer structure to the loft and adjacent sloping roofs. Elevations are also required for the sides of the dormer structure.
- 1.7. No daylighting details submitted in respect of the effect of the rear extensions on adjoining property.
- 1.8. There are no details of access to the front of the building indicated on the drawings, e.g. the existing front entrance steps to ground floor are not shown. Full plans should be submitted now to illustrate proposals for access, the front garden, the boundary treatment to adjoining properties and the public footpath
2. Although the bulk and massing of the proposed lower ground and ground floor extension appear appropriate we note the following.
 - 2.1. The time elapsed approval acquired by default for the existing roof extension is unfortunate, its massing is totally inappropriate. This is perhaps an opportunity to partly rectify the wrong. We propose the massing of the third floor dormer extension is reduced and would thereby be improved by the removal of the pitched roof to the rear of the original roof ridge and replaced with a flat roof. We do not see this as a particularly costly exercise as it appears the rear roof is to be refinished
3. The overall large sizes of openings to the proposed lower ground and ground floor extensions while contrasting, appear excessive particularly at the ground floor where the proportions do not relate to the neighbouring properties, no's 72 and 76. We also note that
 - 3.1. The replacement of the casement window to the loft with two new sash windows to a similar design as the existing at second floor is broadly welcome.
 - 3.2. The proposed new windows are too large, particularly in width. We suggest the width be reduced to the same as the smaller second floor window and the windows be centred on the dormer with greater space between them.
4. The consistency of openings in rear elevations at ground floor and above are largely maintained in adjacent properties as illustrated by submitted photographs. However, in the proposal, the windows to the ground floor rear extension would significantly interrupt this consistency.
5. In the absence of detailed information, it is difficult to comment on the materials to be used and their colour. That being said



Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

- 5.1. It would appear from the rear elevation drawing that large metal framed windows framed by tile clad enclosing walls are being proposed
 - 5.2. Recladding of the existing pitched roof over the third floor appears to be proposed. If so, for consistency it would be preferable for natural slate to be used. In this context see para 2.1
6. As it stands, the style of the proposed development will be both overbearing and antagonistic to neighbouring buildings. It will certainly not enhance the conservation area. The Camden Planning Policy document para 3.1 makes clear that rear extensions should
 - 6.1. Be secondary to the building being extended, in relation to its location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing;
 - 6.2. Be built from materials that wherever possible are sympathetic to the existing building
 - 6.3. Respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style;The current proposal fails on all three criteria
7. The proposal fails to maintain adequate levels of privacy
 - 7.1. The proposed ground floor balcony is only shielded from the adjoining property, no 72, by a tall open metal railing.
 - 7.2. We suggest privacy for the adjoining property would be enhanced by the addition of an opaque glass screen as an addition to or in place of the railing.
8. As noted in para 1.7, no daylighting details have been submitted
9. It would appear that no changes are proposed for the rear garden however there are no details of either existing or proposed enclosure.. Moreover, as noted in 1.8, no details have been submitted for the front garden and entrance area
10. This application is characterised by a lack of important detail and drawings that are technically inadequate. Until these are fully addressed, the proposal will fail



Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

to maintain or enhance the conservation area and should therefore be rejected.



Signed:
David Blagbrough
Chair
Camden Square CAAC

Date: 15 January 2020

