
From: David Blagbrough
Sent: 16 January 2025 16:47
To: Ewan Campbell
Cc: Planning
Subject: 72 Camden Mews 2024/5410/P
Attachments: Comments to council on 72 Camden Mews 16 January 2025.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.

Dear Ewan

I am attaching our comments on the above planning application. You will note that we have recommended that it be rejected.

One puzzling aspect of this application is that details of an earlier application [2024/4270/P](#) and its supporting documentation appear to have been removed from the website. I have always assumed that all historical planning applications are retained since they are often important reference points for current applications. Is there any reason why 72 Camden Mews is being treated differently?

Very best wishes

David

David Blagbrough
Chair
Camden Square CAAC

Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

72 Camden Mews

London NW1

Date: 16 January 2025

Planning application Reference: 2024/5410/P

Proposal: Erection of ground floor front extension with new staircase from ground to 1st and 1st to 2nd floor, two new terraces at 1st and 2nd floors, new metal gate, infill of existing rear conservatory at first floor, new side balcony; erection of set back roof extension with 3 solar panels and air source heat pump; replacement of windows and doors.

Summary: In the absence of adequate contextual information, we cannot support this application and recommend it be rejected

Comments:

1. The proposed drawings are technically adequate and quite detailed. However,
 - 1.1. The existing rear arrangements are difficult to judge. It would help if some 3-D modelling, referred to in the Design & Access statement, were included. Rear external photos submitted by some respondents are helpful, although the applicant could not have been expected to provide views from private gardens.
 - 1.2. There is inconsistency between the location plan in the D&A statement (showing rear patios in the entire terrace) and the downloaded one, which one assumes to be correct.
2. From the information submitted, it is difficult to judge how the massing, scale and rhythm relate to neighbouring properties. Photomontages superimposing the proposed extensions would help
3. Although the D&A statement notes 'we have worked carefully with our 3D model to ensure that privacy and daylight impacts are minimised', there is no evidence given to allow others to confirm whether these impacts are acceptable.

Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

4. This complex proposal remains difficult to assess and it is unfortunate that the previous application 2024/4270/P has disappeared from the Camden Planning website along with all of the valuable comments made by neighbours and the CAAC as well as Camden Planners' response.
5. Bulk, massing and overlooking / overshadowing are likely to be issues, and contextual drawings / 3D models are needed to explain this. Photos submitted by neighbours show the existing rear of the property to include some vary informal structures which may never to have had planning permission, and perhaps this should be borne in mind.
6. Without adequate contextual information, we cannot support this application.

Signed:

Date: 16 January 2025

David Blagbrough

Chair

Camden Square CAAC