**Eton**

**Conservation Area Advisory Committee**

Advice from Eton Conservation Area Advisory Committee: 28.02.2020

**Re 9 Chalcot Gardens, 2019/5738/P.**

**Replacement rear conservatory following demolition of existing rear conservatory; alterations to openings on side elevation**

We object to this proposal on three grounds:

1. The creeping erosion of the open garden space which characterises the Conservation Area
2. The loss of the fabric from the host building
3. The appearance and detailed design of the proposed extension

The current extension received approval in May 2010. According to the Officer’s Delegated Report it was “…considered to be of… acceptable proportions” in terms of its impact on the host building and the Conservation Area. It should be noted , however, that it is approximately twice the size of the modest conservatory which originally stood there.

The replacement extension which is proposed extends around 1.0m further into the garden than the one it would replace. The width appears to be unchanged. So, step by step, the garden space is being increasingly eroded. This is something to which we have objected on number of previous occasions, most recently in relation to 4 Chalcot Gardens (2019/5909/P).

To repeat the point: this type of insidious incremental erosion of the garden space which characterizes the Eton Conservation is something that cannot be supported.

We are concerned at the loss of fabric of the host building. One redeeming aspect of the existing extension is that the bay window, an original feature of the house, although partially covered is still just about visible. In a Conservation Area it is important that the physical integrity of these type of houses is not compromised.

The drawings suggest a rectangular glazed “box” like structure which makes no attempt to harmonise with the host building. The Eton Conservation Area Statement Policy ET22 States:

*“Extensions and conservatories can alter the balance and harmony of a property or of a group*

*of properties by insensitive scale, design or inappropriate materials. Some rear extensions,*

*although not widely visible, so adversely affect the architectural integrity of the building to*

*which they are attached that the character of the Conservation Area is prejudiced. Rear*

*extensions should be as unobtrusive as possible and should not adversely affect the character*

*of the building or the Conservation Area.”*

The proposed extension fails this test just as much as the existing one. There is reference in the planning history to the fact that 9 and 10 Chalcot Gardens are a semi-detached pair. Before the existing extension was built both had smaller symmetrical conservatories which reflected well on the building as a whole. But this proposal is grossly insensitive towards the bay window, part of which is retained, part of which is hacked away.

The plan shows very clearly how badly the new extension treats the bay window - there is a failure of architectural judgement (a crudeness) demonstrated here that should not receive approval in a conservation area.

In summary we would like to see the footprint of the proposed extension reduced to that of the one it is replacing; the original fabric of the host building should be retained; and the extension should be re-designed so that it is more in keeping with the building to which it is attached.

Yours sincerely,

Eton CAAC