

Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

20 South Villas

Date: 28 December 2021

Planning application Reference: 2021/3779/p

Proposal: Erection of single storey extension following demolition of existing conservatory

Dear Leela

Some weeks ago you asked whether the revised proposal for 20 South Villas addresses our objections sufficiently to withdraw our objection to the proposed development.

I apologise for taking so long to get back to you on this – entirely my fault. The comments from my assessor were submitted in mid-December, but they were subsequently overlooked by me in the flurry of activity around the festive season.

The simple answer to your query is no. We would recommend that once again the applicant be invited to revisit and clarify the proposals for further review. We have reached this conclusion for the following reasons

1. Alterations have been made to reduce the width of the 'extension' as described in the application form, i.e. not a conservatory. It is to about the same width as the Conservatory in the 2015 application, but does not include the monopitch roof of that application retaining a lantern light that is similar to, but not so large as the existing.
2. Moreover, many of the points we raised in our submission of 17 October, a copy of which is attached and to which reference is made below, have not been satisfactorily addressed and in some cases the new proposal raises additional questions.
 - 2.1. **Para 1.1** argued for the provision of a Design and Access Statement. However, as the building footprint and the height now appear to be similar to the existing structure, we acknowledge that a D&AS may no longer be required and indeed has been omitted from the papers submitted with the application. That being said, it would seem that a Heritage Statement is required.

Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

- 2.2. **Para 1.2.** There are still no dimensions for the proposed extension.
- 2.3. **Para 1.4** Although the height of the building has been reduced and pulled back from the boundary, we still believe a side elevation should be produced.
- 2.4. **Para 1.5** Photographs have still not been submitted.
- 2.5. **Para 1.6.** Although the overall height to the apex of the roof has been reduced to $\pm 2.8\text{m}$, a lantern light has been retained. We would argue that the lantern light does not help subordination to the original structures and should be changed to a flat rooflight or mono-pitch conservatory roof as was approved for the 2015 proposal.
- 2.6. **Para 1.7.** We note that the existing conservatory, based on the current application, is 2.85m high to the apex of the lantern light and the proposed new extension. The new glazed lantern light is now of similar height but narrower – not so wide.
- 2.7. **Para 1.8** There is a lack of clarity on whether the new structure is an extension - to which Building Regulations would apply - or a Conservatory where Building Regulations would not necessarily apply.
- 2.7.1. Unlike the original drawings in which there was an opening in the rear of the existing house with the space being described an orangery, this proposal retains the existing windows and doors to the lower ground floor of the existing house, but does not identify the use of the new space.
- 2.7.2. The drawing must state the intended use of the space.
- 2.7.3. Anticipating the applicant may intend an extension, as opposed to a conservatory, this proposal would need to be revised to meet Building Regulation standards:
- ∞ The thickness of the roof structure is drawn at $\pm 150\text{mm}$ which is insufficient to accommodate roof structure, insulation and finishes, i.e. about half what would be needed for a warm roof structure
 - ∞ Areas of glazing may be excessive with respect to heat loss.
 - ∞ The internal headroom is drawn at 2.05m. Ideally headroom should be a minimum 2.3m. However, to achieve this, either the floor would have to be lowered or the roof raised. Raising the roof is to be avoided so

Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

lowering the floor would be necessary to improve headroom and accommodate roof structure.

- ∞ External walls, with the exception of the north side, are not, as drawn, thick enough to be insulated to meet insulation standards.

- 2.8. **Para 1.9.** This proposal appears similar to the existing extension in footprint and height. Though not as high as the earlier proposal, it still, to a lesser extent, shields the detailing of the ground floor balcony balustrade.
- 2.9. **Para 1.10.** We acknowledge that the width of the extension reduced has been reduced but the following concerns remain good, but the following still apply.
 - 2.9.1. Para 5 There is still no information about any proposed landscaping
 - 2.9.2. Para 7. The technical inadequacies of the drawings remain



Signed:

David Blagbrough

Chair

Camden Square CAAC

Date: 28 December 2021