



E: [Info@conceptplanning.co.uk](mailto:Info@conceptplanning.co.uk)

W: [www.conceptplanning.co.uk](http://www.conceptplanning.co.uk)

Our Ref: 647

Planning inspectorate  
3D Eagle  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Bristol  
BS1 6PN

7<sup>th</sup> March 2024

**PINS Ref:** APP/X5210/W/23/3335300

**Site - Units 8-9 Pratt Mews, Camden, NW1 0AD**

Dear Des Bowring,

On behalf of our client, Leo Kauffman, we formally respond to the LPA's Appeal Statement and third-party representations provided via PINs on the 4<sup>th</sup> of March 2024.

For clarification purposes the following 3<sup>rd</sup> party comments received include the following 15 individuals.

Ms Alexandra Beck (1a Murray Street)

Miss Krittika Bhattacharya (Flat 3, Regent House 1-6 Pratt Mews)

Mrs Jessica Bosenberg (Flat 1, Regent House 1-6 Pratt Mews)

Mr Rory Cameron (53 Balcorne Street, E9 7AY)

Freeman Household (four individuals)

Mr Joseph Mckenna (Flat 2, 7a Pratt mews - a property benefiting from additional roof storey creating a 4 storey building)

Mr Abi Odujoko (14, Pratt Mews NW1 0AD - a property benefiting from additional roof storey creating a 4 storey building)

Mr Olusola Solanke (RCCG 14 Pratt Mews - a property benefiting from additional roof storey creating a 4 storey building)

Mr Chris Taylor (Flat 4, 7a Pratt Mews - a property benefiting from additional roof storey creating a 4 storey building)

Mr Adam Samm (Flat 4, Regent House 1-6 Pratt Mews)

Mr Simon Williams (Feast Creative Ltd, 12-13 Pratt Mews, NW1 0AD)

Mr Chris Turner (8-9 Pratt Mews)



For the avoidance of doubt the planning appeal relates to a single reason for refusal (ground) pertaining to the character and design (see refusal reason below). No other material matters are in dispute or are the subject of the planning appeal.

**“The proposed development, by reason of its size, bulk, and location would be an incongruous and dominant addition which would harm the character and appearance of the host building and the mews terrace of which it is part, causing harm to the significance of this part of the Camden Town Conservation Area contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of Camden’s Local Plan 2017”.**

#### **LPA Appeal statement:**

The submitted LPA appeal statement provides additional commentary to accompany the appeal and broad reasons outlined in the delegated officers report and decision notice. Comments are made against certain paragraphs of the council’s appeal statement.

Para 2.6...Also, as aforementioned, these were permitted before the CTCAA. The appellant also draws attention to the building behind the appeal site, No 7 (or known as 78 Camden High Street), but the Council note this building is hidden from view from the mews by No 8 and sits within the shadow of 43-47 King's Terrace beyond, and therefore does not have a bearing on the perceived scale of the mews

Comment – The key aspect is whether the additional height resulting from the roof extension at No 8-9 Pratt Mews would not result in visual harm when viewed from the entrance to Pratt Mews. Currently there is built form behind the mansard at No 8-9 Pratt Mews, and therefore, the proposed upward projection sought under the appeal would purely replace this backdrop without piercing the sky beyond what is currently in situ.

Para 2.9 Although the Council are not applying a strict adherence to the CTCAA in terms of modern development, the document clearly informs this modern standard. The Camden Town Conservation Area statement states that *‘The predominantly two-storey buildings give the narrow passages their special scale’*. The addition of an appropriately scaled mansard storey is considered to respect and reference the historic scale, as the set-back and angled façade maintain a sense of subordinacy to the main facade.

Comment – The addition of a mansard extension as the only suitable and appropriate addition to respect the Mews is a subjective view. The LPAs stance is localised opinion that is not prescribed in policy and is ultimately an interpretation of a loose policy that is not prescriptive. The appellant considers the councils view on this matter to be overly restrictive



and applies excessive weight to restrict upward extensions, at odds with the upward extensions at No 7, 14, 15 Pratt Mews which have altered the character of the Mews. The appellant recognises the extensions at No 14 and 15 were granted in 1990 (Ref 9003354) although the physical impact of the extensions has changed the character of the Mews and further distances and alters the facts on the ground. The substantive extensions at 7 (or 78 Camden High Street as it is also known) was approved post the CTCAA adoption and is a significant material factor in the appeal.

Para 2.12 The appellant argues that the mews does not experience high footfall, and although that may be true by some comparison, there are many users of the mews who will appreciate the immediate character of the streetscape: residents, businesses whose premises are there, members of the two churches that meet there, as well as those visiting the Camden Foodbank which operates there.

Comment – It is not denied there is some footfall on the Mews and the subject is covered by the 3<sup>rd</sup> party comments, alluded to activities on the Mews. Nevertheless, Pratt Mews is not a busy thoroughfare and the appellant retains the view footfall is limited in this regard, even considering the foodbank (which is not open 24/7) and other commercial business on the Mews.

### **Third party responses:**

Many of the third-party comments address aspects such privacy, light and outlook. As forementioned in the letter, such planning matters are not in dispute between the Local planning authority and the appellant and do not form a reason for refusal. This letter does not seek address these comments.

The letter prepared by miss Charlotte Freeman is a significant assessment of the appeal grounds and seeks to dispute 11 appeal grounds and mattes. In summary, the letter lists the following concerns, which is not exhaustive,

- CTCAA review
- Public benefit
- Public interaction
- Accuracy of CGIs and drawings
- Interpretation of the policy criteria

The appellant is content to leave the merits of the so called “Flawed” stances put forward by C Freeman to the inspector’s assessment and ultimate decision. However, the stance in para 1.1 that “the Council has **never** departed from the CTCAA guidance for Pratt mews developments” is somewhat of a definitive statement that is difficult to justify.



The concerns raised by occupiers of No 7a regarding privacy and security is mitigated by there being no access from the extension to the side roof and the bedroom windows facing the terrace (which is already significantly overlooked already on account of the high urban grain of the location) could be obscure glazed and fixed shut, secured by condition.

The appeal statement (grounds) seeks to clearly outline the arguments for why the appeal should be allowed. The CTCAA is dated guidance and offers no direct stipulation that development should be two storey with a mansard. The approach regarding two storey buildings and mansard atop is a local stance with the council confirm they are “not applying a strict adherence to the CTCAA”. As such, the material weight to be applied to the CTCAA is debatable. The upward extension of No 9 primarily would retain a bank of two storey mews buildings between No 9 (part appeal site) and No 14 Pratt Mews. As such, the two storey original character of Pratt Mews would be clearly identifiable and reflection of the historic urban grain.

The proposed mansard roof extension is appropriate for the location and would have less than substantial harm to the views along the roof tops of the Pratt Mews which in any event are not identified in the CTCAA as protected vistas. The proposed mansard roof extension would not harmfully disrupt the visual integrity of the Mews and on balance would not run counter to the aspirations and content of core planning policies in the Camden Local Plan (2017) policies D1 (Design) and D2 (heritage).

#### **Other Matters:**

The introduction of new residential floorspace in a highly sustainable location in need of more residential floorspace is a substantive planning consideration weighing in favour of the development. The UK is in a deep housing crisis and while the additional floorspace is modest, all additions would help to alleviate the issue.

**The appellant would kindly request an accompanied site visit with the inspector.**

Yours sincerely,

**James Clark BA (Hons), MCD, MRTPI  
Concept Planning Ltd**

