

From: David Blagbrough [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 February 2020 22:13
To: Lawlor, Josh [REDACTED]
Subject: 74 St Augustine's Road

Dear Josh

Many thanks for your e-mail of 27 January.

1. We note the various improvements to the rear elevation in particular

1. The use of brick in the lower and upper ground floor extensions
2. The reduction in the height of the extensions
3. The reduction in the ground floor width thus preserving the existing bay window profile

We would, however, like to suggest that a number of further improvements could be achieved by

4. Stipulating that new brickwork should be constructed in second hand stock bricks to match the existing.
 5. Removing the circular concrete columns between windows in order to maintain the rhythm of neighbouring buildings,
 6. Having one central brick pier (rather than 3 columns) at the lower ground thus aligning with that above at the corner of the ground floor extension
 7. Using timber framed rather than steel framed windows to ensure that they are more in keeping with adjoining properties.
2. We continue to have concerns over the third floor dormer
8. We believe that natural slate should be stipulated as the front roof slopes and not 'grey fibre cement tiles' as indicated in notes on the rear elevation drawing. The use of the latter on the third floor dormer is out of keeping for the building and its neighbouring properties
 9. The roof height of the dormer at third floor should be reduced along with a reduction of the new windows at that level.
 10. There is no detail for the tiling/slating to the front roof. We would hate to see artificial slate appear in place of the original slate!

At this moment, given the presence of a temporary roof over the whole house and significant work in progress, there is clearly an opportunity to accommodate these suggestions, though from what you say we are aware that given the nature of current legislation it may be difficult to enforce

3. In addition, as noted in para 1.8 of our original comments, the absence of details for the front entrance steps, front garden and boundary walls/railings is a serious omission. These details should be submitted as part of the application.
4. Other points that appear not to have been addressed are those relating to Paras 7.1, 7.2, 8 and 9

Although there has been considerable improvement in the proposed development, as is evident from the above, there is still room for more and the lack adequate detail remains a concern. Until these issues are adequately addressed, we remain unconvinced that proposal satisfies the basic criterion of maintaining or enhancing the conservation area and would recommend that approval is withheld.

Warmest regards

David

David Blagbrough
Chair
Camden Square CAAC