

**From:** david.blagbrough@btinternet.com  
**Sent:** 14 December 2021 14:37  
**To:** Obote Hope; Planning Planning  
**Subject:** 14 St Augustine's Road Ref 2021/4695/p  
**Attachments:** Comments on 14 Stratford Villas 14 December 2021.docx

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious. Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Obote

I am attaching our comments on the above proposal. You will note that we recommend the application be rejected.

Keep safe and well

Best wishes

David

David Blagbrough  
Chair  
Camden Square CAAC

## Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

14 Stratford Villas  
London

**Date:** 14 December 2021

**Planning application Reference:** 2021/4695/P

**Proposal:** Change of use from 2 x self-contained flats to a dwelling house and erection of a three storey rear infill extension from basement level, installation of metal balustrade and replacement of the third floor window with new door to use the flat roof of the second floor extension as a roof terrace

**Summary:** The proposed development is both inappropriate in terms of its bulk and in its failure to maintain the rhythm of neighbouring buildings. The proposed development fails to maintain or enhance the conservation area and should be rejected

### Comments:

1. There are concerns over the drawings: they would be adequate if adjacent buildings were more clearly shown.
2. In relation to neighbouring buildings, the bulk of the proposed development is inappropriate
  - 2.1. The 3-storey infill extension appears to entirely fill the gap between rear extensions, removing any sense of individual existing extensions.
3. The proposal fails to maintain the rhythm of neighbouring buildings.
  - 3.1. The traditional-style sash windows of the proposed infill conflict with the post-war utilitarian fenestration of the existing extension, creating an uneasy impression that the infill is original, but on the wrong side.
  - 3.2. The scale and proportions of the two halves of the proposed unified extension conflict with each other.
4. In our view, this proposal should be rejected:
  - 4.1. The proposed extension is neither subservient to nor a beneficial contrast to the existing rear extension of the same height.

## Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

- 4.2. Information available online but not given in the application appears to show that no other house in the terrace has a three-storey infill extension; the only full width extension of that height is a modern structure at the SW end of the terrace, not an infill.
5. We note that this application involves a rear extension infill and roof terrace a storey higher than a similar earlier application (2020/5041/P) which was approved in March this year. We suggest that the developers stick with the latter



**Signed:**

David Blagbrough

Chair

Camden Square CAAC

**Date:** 14 December 2021