

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|------------|
| 2020/1663/P | [REDACTED] | 02/06/2020 11:33:01 | COMMENT | [REDACTED] |

Re 29 Steele's Road, 2020/1663/P

Erection of conservatory with partial green roof to rear of garden flat. Demolition of existing lower ground floor structure and erection of single storey rear extension, alterations to rear windows at the upper ground floor and extension of balcony; erection of front and rear single storey side extension; alteration to front and rear garden, all to Flat 1.

No 29 is the last house, the end house, at the western end of its terrace in Steele's Road. During the 1870s or early 80s someone thought to take advantage of its being so, and added a slim extension up to third floor height on the end wall of the house, along with an extension to the back. These extensions, perhaps not especially obvious at first glance, are of a piece with the notable Batterbury and Huxley studio houses further along the road. Their presence and level of detailing are in fact a good deal more sophisticated than the those of the terrace they are additions to. They were to be the only additions to the terrace till quite recent times. -> making them, in short, historic extensions.

The large mullioned window of this rear extension has for a long time been part of the bigger picture of the house. And to take the mullions out, and erase the quoiring, so as to just leave a large aperture to be filled with steel windows, is to do damage to the garden elevation. We fully understand the reason for the balcony, but access to it is readily available from the study. To retain this major presence in the elevation is not to prevent ease of access to outside.

The proposed steel windows on this level appear to spoil the consistency of use of timber in the alterations and extension to the back of the house. A consistent use of timber as regards the windows would surely be more appropriate. But the timber cladding, though proposed, is not shown. Evidence is needed before anyone can tell if, in this context, its use is apposite or not.

The balcony, as with most balconies, raises the issue of overlooking. We ask for confirmation that Camden's guidelines on visual privacy and overlooking has been followed -> that the rooms of Nos 28 and 30 adjoining their gardens, and the parts of the gardens nearest to those rooms, are safe guarded in these respects.

To bring the space of the existing storage area into the overall lower ground floor plan makes perfect sense. But the bedroom window at the front is, by way of elevation (despite being brought forward by way of plan), aligned to the old side extension. But it appears to take all its readings from the bay windows of the main block of the house. Could this window be reconsidered?

The proposal in question is well thought through and there is no overall objection. On the contrary. But further evidence should be provided as regards the cladding. The mixture of steel and timber windows should not go ahead. The large mullioned window must be retained. The removal of such an element would contribute to the erosion of the things that make up a conservation area. Its retention is dependent on our approval.

Yours sincerely,

Application No: Consultees Name: Received: Comment: Response:

Printed on: 08/06/2020 09:10:07

