

CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Case reference number(s)

2021/5437/P

Case Officer:

Miriam Baptist

Application Address:

36 Camden Square
London
NW1 9XA

Proposal(s)

Amalgamation of basement flat with upper floors to form one single dwellinghouse, erection of single storey side extension, installation of a ground source heat pump enclosure in front garden, fenestration alterations and replacement double glazed windows to front and rear, and the addition of 2 rooflights to the front and side roofslopes.

Representations

Consultations:	No. notified	0	No. of responses	4	No. of objections	4
					No of comments	0
					No of support	0
Summary of representations (Officer response(s) in italics)	<p>Press advert displayed from 06/01/2022 and site notice displayed from 05/05/2022 to 29/01/2022.</p> <p>3 neighbouring properties and the Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC) objected to the original and second revisions. Grounds of the objections received are summarised below. The design has since been revised and the CAAC has withdrawn their objection in response to this third and final proposal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Architectural inconsistency with the east side of Camden Square2. Architectural inconsistency with no 353. Exclusion of light/space for 37 Camden Square4. Potential for Structural damage/ subsidence risk/ impact on existing					

precarious Victorian drainage system

5. Insufficient rationale (staircase to replace internal staircase) in light of disruption caused to residents and potential access issues for garden flat at no 37.

Officer response

It is to be noted that whereas the first and second designs proposed involved a side extension at lower ground and upper ground floors, the third revised design is significantly reduced and only extends at lower ground floor. This revision is generally considered to alleviate the objections received.

- 1. The final revised proposal revision, submitted after and in response to objections, is significantly reduced and the side extension is restricted to the lower ground of the property. The extension is now considered modest, not unduly noticeable from the public realm or from neighbouring properties. The proposal now respects and maintains the historic gap between semi-detached properties. It is considered neither bulky nor incongruous in context of the host building, surrounding properties or wider conservation area.*
- 2. The final revised proposal is significantly reduced and being restricted to the lower ground floor is not considered unduly noticeable from the public realm or from neighbouring properties. It is not expected to be particularly apparent from the streetscape or to take away from the symmetry with adjacent no 35 to which it is joined.*
- 3. The significant reduction of the proposed side extension is not considered to have any negative impact on light to neighbouring properties. In terms of the historic gap and visual space between nos 36 and 37, this is considered sensitively maintained by only extending at lower ground floor level.*
- 4. The proposal is modest and it is not considered it would have significant negative impact in terms of structural issues, potential subsidence or local drainage.*
- 5. The design was initially at a higher level to accommodate a staircase at higher level and bike store at lower level; it has now been reduced significantly by removing the staircase and instead now only consists of a lower ground extension to accommodate bike storage, general storage and a WC.*

**Recommendation:-
Grant planning permission**