

Dear Mr Tulloch

RECEIVED

I am writing to object to application ref 2013/1210/P on behalf of the residents of the nearby Belvard Point in Murray Street which is also within the Camden Square Conservation Area.

CULTURE & ENVIRONMENT

I am not objecting to the principle of residential development of this site. Indeed totally the opposite. I really feel that the site is crying out to be developed, but it needs to be appropriate.

The application site is on the junction of St Augustine's Road and Agar Grove, close to the junction with Murray Street. Being on the junction of these 3 roads it is a prominent site. It is triangular in shape, tapering towards the junction of the 3 roads.

The site is on the southern boundary of the Camden Square Conservation Area. The site's prominence on the junctions on the edge of the conservation area make this a key gateway site into the conservation area and separating it from the bland 1960's flats to the south.

The importance of providing a high quality contextual solution to the redevelopment of this site is vital

Planning application 2008/4783/P for a part 3, 4 and 5 storey building to create 9 units was refused on 1 July 2009 AND dismissed on appeal in January 2010. There were a number of reasons for refusing that application relating to lack of S106 contributions (which can be resolved) but the key refusal reason was as follows:

- 1. The proposed development, by reason of its scale and detailed design, would appear as an incongruous feature on this prominent site, failing to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Camden Square Conservation Area or the wider area contrary to policies B1 (general design principles) and B7 (conservation areas) of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006, guidance within the Camden Planning Guidance (2006) and Camden Square Conservation Area Statement.*

Following that a further application ref 2010/6748/P for a part 3, 4 and 5 storey building for 9 residential units was refused on 8 April 2011. Again while there were a number of reasons for refusal based on the lack of a S106 obligation, which can be addressed, the key reason for refusing the application was as follows:

- 1. The proposed development, by reason of its scale and design, would appear as an incongruous feature on this prominent site, failing to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Camden Square Conservation Area or the wider area contrary to policies CS14 (promoting high quality places and conserving our*

*heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 (securing high quality design) and DP25 (conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.*

The key issue in the determination of this application therefore, reflecting upon policies in the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Policies, as well as Camden Square Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, is whether the proposal overcomes the concerns in the refusal of the above applications and enhances the character of this important Conservation Area. I have deliberately not said preserve, as this is such a key site on the gateway to the conservation area in a very prominent site, that merely to preserve is not sufficient, any development should be required to enhance the area.

I have considered very carefully the Planning statement, design and access statement and plans submitted with this application. The agents contend that their proposal "is sensitive, respectful and complimentary and would enhance the character of the conservation area" (para 6.4 of planning statement.) They say that their design responds to the architectural features of nearby buildings and maintains their character extending the rhythm of the street (para 6.6) and that the scale and massing responds to its neighbours.

However, they also state in para 7.2 that application ref 2010/6748/P was only refused due to a lack of a legal agreement, which is clearly incorrect as can be seen above.

Consideration of the submitted site block plan, the contextural plans of St Augustines Road and Agar Grove and the computer generated images showing existing and proposed street scenes, demonstrate a development that is completely out of context with the street scene and neighbouring properties and is harmful to the character of the area while being totally inappropriate for this important gateway site within the Conservation Area.

The design is blocky, the scale and massing completely at odds with the surrounding developments, the design is bland and the balcony details appear tacked on.

This is a extremely important site and must be developed sensitively. The proposed development does not preserve the character of the area and most certainly does not enhance it. It is harmful to the area and to the street scene being completely out of character not just in design but by virtue of its scale and massing and footprint..

The development is therefore contrary to paragraph 137 of the National Planning Policy Framework, as well as remaining contrary to policies CS14 (promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and

policies DP24 (securing high quality design) and DP25 (conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies. It is also contrary to the aims and objectives of the Camden Square Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2011.

As it does not preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area, the application must be refused. There is legal case law stating that if a development in a conservation area does not at the very least preserve the character of the area there is no other appropriate decision but to refuse the application. No other mitigation can override that.

In terms of the other reasons for refusing the previous applications relating to S106 matters, that clearly is a matter of the LPA to assess.

The final consideration relates to matters of amenity both for prospective and neighbouring occupiers. This is a site on a busy junction and the external balconies proposed will not be usable - which again backs up the inappropriate and tacked on design. Furthermore the massing and blocky nature of the proposal will result in harm to the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties by virtue of loss of outlook.

The LPA is respectfully requested to refuse the application.

I wish to be kept informed of any Committee date in order that I may attend and speak.

Kind regards

Dave Harris

