

Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	08/11/2012
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	25/10/2012
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Angela Ryan			2012/4597/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
67A Chetwynd Road London NW5 1BX			Refer to draft decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s) Erection of an infill extension at first floor level and a partial infill mansard roof extension at second floor level, and alterations to the York Rise elevation in connection with existing use as a self-contained maisonette (Class C3)					
Recommendation:		Grant Planning Permission			
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice				
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	(A) 9 (B) 2	No. of responses No. Electronic	(A)1 (B) 2	(A) No. of objections (B) No Objections	(A) 1 (B) 2
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed between 27/09/2012 and 18/10/2012 and a notice published in the local press on 04/10/2012 expiring on the 25/10/2012. The application was also subject to two periods of consultation, outlined above and below as consultation A) and B)</p> <p><u>Consultation (A)</u> A total of 9 letters were sent to neighbouring occupiers on 24/09/2012 expiring on 15/10/2012. One letter of objection was received from the occupier of Bellgate Studios located in Bellgate Mews. A summary of the objection is below:</p> <p><u>Consultation (B)</u> After the submission of an amended scheme all of the original objectors were re-consulted on 20/11/12, expiring on 27/11/12. A total of 2 objections were received from the occupier of Bellgate Studios located in Bellgate News, and the occupier of no. 26 Brookfield Road. All responses are summarised below:</p> <p><u>Consultation (A)</u> <u>Objections:</u> <u>Design/impact on character and appearance of the conservation area:</u> - The development changes the landscape and view in the conservation area (Officer's response: See section 2 of this report)</p> <p><u>Amenity:</u> - Loss of light (Officer's response: See section 3 of this report) - Loss of outlook (Officer's response: See section 3 of this report)</p> <p><u>Consultation (B)</u> <u>Objections:</u> <u>Design/impact on character and appearance of the conservation area:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Metal windows are not in keeping with the conservation area- Increase in height of parapet wall increases bulk of the development- Changes the front elevation entirely changes the character of the façade. It is difficult to understand how the contemporary design relates to the traditional architecture in the area, host building and surrounding buildings- Fenestration design should not be dealt with via a condition- Proposed alterations do not serve to enhance the conservation area and timber framed windows are necessary if a cohesive development overall is to be achieved <p><u>Amenity:</u> - Loss of outlook to residents located on the opposite side of Chetwynd Road (Officer's response: see para 3.1 in this report)</p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments:	<p><u>Dartmouth Park CAAC:</u> Raised objections on the following grounds:</p> <p><u>Design/impact on character and appearance of the conservation area:</u> - The Inspector's report of 10/05/12 on application 2012/1513/P say that the principle of infilling above first floor was acceptable but points out that the proposed second floor element does not respect the architectural composition of the host and adjoining buildings. This comment was made when the building was recessed behind the front edge of the building and behind a railing. The new application has no recess and no railing and is therefore even more aggressively prominent and unacceptable (Officer's response: See paragraph 2.5 in this report) - Bulk and prominence failing to enhance the conservation area (Officer's response: See section 2 of this report) - Inappropriate materials (tiles used to clad the walls on the York Rise elevation and</p>					

proposed UPVC windows) (**Officer's response:** see paragraph 1.4 and section 2 of this report)

- Design of door needs to correspond with adjacent building (**Officer's response:** See section 2 of this report)

Amenity:

Long views between the houses on Dartmouth Park Road would be obscured (**Officer's response:** see section 3 of this report)

Other:

- The plan of the proposed flat is so similar to the previous scheme submitted (**Officer's response:** This is not a material planning consideration)

Chetwynd and Twisden Roads Residents' Association: Object on the following grounds:

Design/Impact on character and appearance of the conservation area:

- Proposal would fail to preserve and enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area (**Officer's response:** See section 2 of this report)
- Design is inferior, object to the second floor window and mansard dormer, design of proposed sash windows, alterations to the ground floor shopfront-York Rise elevation(**Officer's response:** See paragraph 1.4 in this report)
- Bulk and mass (**Officer's response:** See section 2 of this report)

Amenity:

- Flat does not comply with Lifetime Home Statement (**Officer's response:** A statement is not normally required for applications of this nature as residential use exist at the site and the application is for infill extensions)
- Loss of light (**Officer's response:** See section 3 of this report)
- Loss of outlook (**Officer's Response:** See section 3 of this report)

Other matters:

- Description of development does not give full description (**Officer's response:** The description of development was corrected to take into account all the works proposed)
- Unit described as a flat/maisonette but should be described as a single family dwelling house (**Officer's response:** The application site comprises a self-contained maisonette)
- The proposed second floor occupies what is currently an area belonging to no 67 and 67 should be included in the description (**Officer's response:** The area of the application site is totally in the demise of no. 67a Chetwynd Road)
- Dormer window not shown on second floor plan/elevation (**Officer's response:** The proposed dormer window has since been omitted from the scheme)
- Plan shows a solid line enclosure between application site and no. 65 Chetwynd Road (**Officer's response:** The side boundary within the remit of the application site would comprise a solid wall as a result of the proposals)
- Sections do not label the terraces (**Officer's response:** The terraced areas are identified on the existing and proposed floor layouts)
- There is no Agent registered but certificate B is signed by a representative of TBD Architects (**Officer's response:** This issue does not affect the Council's consideration of the application)
- If the first floor bathroom layout is altered then the extension could be reduced and result in giving the tenants a larger external space (**Officer's response:** This is not a planning consideration as it does not form part of the application proposals)

A further objection was received from the Residents' Association. A summary of the objections are as follows:

Design:

- The revised design by seeking a modern solution (but unresolved with no details - see our comments under Design below) does not harmonize with the adjacent buildings and by combining "decorative headers" to the first floor windows is inconsistent. It does not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area as the applicant claims (**Officer's response:** The first floor windows do not have decorative headers. See section 2 of this report)

- The proposed design is entirely unsympathetic to the roofscape/profile of its neighbours Nos 67 Chetwynd and 33 York Rise (both have hipped roofs), or the wider streetscape (**Officer's response:** A hipped roofed extension at this particular site would result in a much more bulkier extension and would sit awkwardly on this part of the building, hence the revision sought by the Council's design officer. See section 2 of this report).

- The revised windows are slightly narrower though deeper than the original application but are still oversized in relation to the scale of the two-storey building itself. The two first floor windows if similar in size to the one existing window would in principle be acceptable.
- However there is a total lack of design detail, they are shown as blank spaces; there is no indication whether the frames are wood or metal or how the windows open. In an application which is now proposing a 'contemporary' style, quality of detailing is critical. This lack of information is not acceptable for an application in a conservation area (**Officer's response:** see paragraph 2.2 in this report).
- The excessively large roof light in the sloping roof of the proposed second floor extension is unacceptable. It would be clearly visible from the rising eastern part of Chetwynd Road (**Officer's response:** See paragraph 2.5 in this report)
- The roof light of the bathroom extension should have a conservation flush rooflight and be obscure glazing for privacy (**Officer's response:** See paragraph 3.2 in this report).

Amenity:

- Queried the size of the living room and whether it met Council standards (**Officer's response:** The Council does not have standard sizes for living rooms. The space is a combined kitchen/dining and living area and the space has not been delineated for any of the specific uses, therefore the size of the living room cannot be assumed).-
- We disagree about the loss of daylight and outlook for the residents of the maisonettes in Nos 65 and 67. The bulk introduced on both first and second floors will clearly affect the neighbours' amenities (**Officer's response:** see paragraph 1.4 and 3.3 in this report)
- In our view, the amenity of residents of No 67 and No 65 will be as much affected by reduced loss of light as outlook. The small first floor terrace at No 65 sits at significantly lower level to No 67. Residents will lose daylight, some sky, reduced outlook by way of bulk, a rising flank wall to just under the eaves of No 33 York Rise. (**Officer's response:** See section 3.3 and 3.4 of this report)

Other matters:

The terrace at No 65 is shown as a 'yard' on Ground and First Floor Drwg Scheme 1_11. This is **not a yard** but a terrace at first floor level used by residents of the maisonette at No 65. Sections do not label this terrace, they should as it would facilitate understanding the impact of the proposed bulk at first and second floors to the neighbours at No 65. (**Officer's response:** The terrace and its use at no. 65 Chetwynd Road will be unaffected by the proposals)

-The applicant's initial Design and Access statement claimed consent was granted for a roof terrace at second floor (2004/1959/P) and partially started with the implementation of balustrading. With the revised set back extension at second floor it is not clear where the terrace of the maisonette at no.67 will end or whether in future the intention is to divide the terrace. This should be clarified. (**Officer's response:** As a result of the development the terrace at no. 67 Chetwynd Road would be slightly enlarged and would the wall of the proposed first floor addition would provide the enclosure. The terrace at no 67a Chetwynd Road would be lost as a result of the proposals)

A further objection was received on 3rd December 2012 from the Resident's Association. a summary of the objections are as follows:

Design:

- Proposed windows to be installed on the York Rise elevation would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area
- Roofscape/profile is an unsympathetic and discordant feature

Amenity:

- light pollution by virtue of the proposed skylight in the roofslope at second floor level
- Loss of outlook to occupiers of no. 65 Chetwynd Road

Site Description

The site comprises a two-storey building located on the west side of York Rise, and adjoins two corner properties on each side to the north and south. The application site is used as a self-contained maisonette. The building is located within a group of buildings where there is a parade of commercial uses located on the ground floor with residential/office uses situated on the upper floors.

It should be noted that the use of the premises as two separate units was undertaken without the benefit of planning permission, but evidence shows that they have been in existence as two separate dwellings for more than four years and therefore the use is deemed lawful.

The site is not listed but lies within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. The corner buildings to which the application site is attached (nos.67 Chetwynd Road and 33 York Rise) are identified as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Relevant History

25/05/83 permission **granted** for the erection of a rear extension at 1st floor level to provide an additional habitable room together with alterations to the side elevation at ground floor level. (Ref:36064)

14/06/98 permission **refused** for construction of a 2nd floor rear extension facing York Rise to provide additional bedroom and bathroom for the existing flat as shown on drawing no.8/77OA as revised on 7th May 1988. (Ref:8701338)

10/04/00 planning permission **granted** for the change of use of ground floor from workshop/showroom to residential to form a new entrance to flat above shop, and associated external alterations to York Rise frontage.(Ref: PE9900475)

11/03/04 permission **refused** for formation of new sliding doors, new access steps and a timber ballustrade at second floor level to create a roof terrace on an existing flat roof at 67 Chetwynd Road (Ref: 2004/0153/P)

13/07/04 planning permission **granted** for Formation of a roof terrace at 2nd floor level including new door at 67 Chetwynd Road. (Ref:2004/1959/P)

23/12/08 planning permission **refused** for erection of a shed on roof terrace at 2nd floor level to the upper floor flat at 67 Chetwynd Road (Class C3). (Ref: 2008/4682/P)

30/06/11 Planning permission **refused** for the erection of an infill extension at second floor level, installation of new windows at first floor level and new entrance door at ground floor level to York Rise elevation of no.67a, and installation of new window at front and enlargement of existing window at rear at no. 67, in association with change of use from retail unit and studio flat and creation of a new 2 bedroom maisonette (Class C3) (Class C3) (2011/1482/P). The Council's decision was subsequently upheld on appeal (Ref: APP/X5210/A/11/2157087)

25/05/12- Planning permission **refused** for the erection of an infill extensions at first and second floor levels including the installation of 3 x velux roof lights to be located on the sloping roofs of the extension, the installation of sash windows at ground and first floor levels on the York Rise elevation and installation of a new entrance door at ground floor level on the York Rise elevation at no 67a Chetwynd Road and increased terraced area at the rear of no. 67 Chetwynd Road in connection with existing use as residential units (Class C3). (Ref:2012/1513/P)

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010

Core Strategy:

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

Development Policies:

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's Heritage)

DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

Camden Planning Guidance 2011:

CPG1: Chapters, 1, 2 & 4

CPG2: Chapter 4

CPG6: Chapter 6 & 7

Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement 2009

London Plan 2011

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

Assessment

1. Proposal

1.1 The applicant proposes infill extensions on the side elevation of the application site at first and second floor levels. The single storey extension at first floor level is to be used for a bathroom/wc and the second floor element is to be used as a Kitchen and dining area.

1.2 It is also proposed to install new windows on all levels of the application site and install a new door at ground floor level on the York Rise elevation of the application site. In respect to the proposed infill extensions, two velux style rooflights are proposed on the roofslope of the proposed first floor element and a proposed velux rooflight and glass roof/skylight on the roof slope of the second storey element. The parapet wall on the York Rise elevation will be raised in height which would result in the removal of the existing railings in the location.

Previous applications

1.3 An application for an infill extension was previously refused in 2011 (2011/1482/P -see relevant planning history) and was subsequently upheld on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate by virtue of its bulk and massing, proposed alterations to the front elevation, overbearing sense of enclosure, and the loss of light and outlook. It should be noted that the Inspector considered that in townscape terms the principle of infilling would be acceptable.

1.4 A subsequent application for infill extensions at first and second floor levels was also refused in 2012 (Ref: 2012/1513/P See relevant planning history) as it was considered that the proposal failed to respect the design of the host building and the architectural integrity of the immediately surrounding buildings. However it was not refused on grounds of amenity as the reduced bulk of the half width infill and sloped roof profile was considered to have successfully addressed the appeal inspectors concerns in relation to loss of light and outlook from properties at No. 56 and 67 Chetwynd Road.

Revisions

1.5 During the course of the application the scheme has been revised as follows:-

- Increasing the height of the parapet wall by 0.3m on the York Rise elevation in order to make the opening on the second floor infill extension appear smaller;
- A reduction in size of the second floor, including the removal of the flat roof element previously proposed (the proposal now proposes a pitched roof profile as originally proposed for application ref 2012/1513/P). The proposed second floor element has also been set back 0.8m from the York Rise elevation;
- Existing openings on the York Rise elevation of the application site has been altered in terms of their design to provide single panes of glass instead of the two sashes as originally proposed;
- Removal of the existing railings at first floor level on the York Rise elevation
- Addition of a rooflight in the proposed first floor element
- Removal of two roofs lights and replacement with a skylight on the proposed second storey element.

1.6 These revisions are considered to be relatively minor and therefore do not significantly alter the scheme shown on the plans which were originally submitted with this application. The key planning issues to therefore consider are:

- The impact of the development on the appearance of the host building and conservation area; and
- The impact of the development on the amenity of adjoining/surrounding occupiers

2. Design: impact of the development on the appearance of the host building and conservation area

2.1 The conservation area statement describes nos. 61-67 (odd, north side) as a homogeneous group, in stock brick with polychromatic detail, of shops with living accommodation on two floors above. It stipulates that these buildings form an important distinctive part of the Neighbourhood Shopping Centre at the crossroads with York Rise, and that the uniformity of the three corner shops having canted corners, were ruined in the early 1990s, no 67 by over-painting and inappropriate alterations to the ground floor.

2.2 The ground floor of the application site currently has a shop window on the York Rise elevation that is part of the village pet premises at no. 67 Chetwynd Road. The other part of the premises which is subject to this application has the appearance of a small self contained retail unit, but upon inspection is being used as kitchen and workshop with a staircase leading up to the first floor bedroom and bathroom areas. The existing shopfront is considered to be of little architectural merit and is currently in a bad state of repair. The design of the new structure has been given very careful consideration in conjunction with design officers at the Council following the two previous refusals.

2.3 The pastiche approach initially proposed using traditionally designed sash windows with brick arches was considered to be incongruous as the ground floor elements were cramped and sat awkwardly on the building. The revised proposals for alterations to the front elevation include newly designed and better proportioned windows on all levels and a new door at ground floor level on the York Rise elevation. These elements will be aluminium framed as is the existing window located at first floor level of the application site. The shopfront style ground floor facade is to be retained. The alterations proposed on the York Rise elevation are considered to be appropriate in the context of the surroundings providing for a more cohesive development overall. As such this element of the proposal is considered to represent an improvement to the York Rise elevation and therefore no design issues are raised. An appropriate condition seeking details of the window

frame materials, jambs head and cill of all the new window openings and new facing materials will be added to the decision notice.

First floor infill extension:

2.4 The proposed single storey aspect at first floor level will be approximately 3m high at ridge height sloping down to approximately 2.1m high at its lowest point (eaves level) and will be 1.6m deep and 3.1m wide. This element of the proposal is to have a rendered wall (painted white) and incorporate a pitched slate roof with 2x velux rooflights inserted on the roofslope. This element of the proposal would be largely obscured from the wider public realm given its height (rising marginally above the side boundary wall), and location (it being set back from the front edge of the building on York Rise and being obscured by the existing building at first floor level). It would be seen from the upper floor rear windows of some of the buildings along Chetwynd Road.

Second floor infill extension:

2.5 In respect of the infill extension the Inspector previously concluded that in townscape terms the principle of infilling the space above first floor level at the application site is acceptable. It is not possible to achieve a traditional form of roof extension for the partial infill approach required in order to address amenity considerations, and therefore a more modern design approach has been adopted. The roof form is a simple mono pitched roof clad in slate set behind the parapet. Where it differs from wholly traditional roof 'forms' is that the front elevation, which is clad in slate, is shear rather than pitched. The reason for adopting this approach is based largely on the inspector's decision which allowed the principle of a roof extension on the property but to only allow it to be 'part width' due to issues of maintaining light levels to nos. 65 and 67a Chetwynd Road.

2.6 The proposed second storey element as revised would be approximately 4m high at ridge height sloping down to 2m at its lowest point (eaves level) and approximately 3.2m deep and 6m wide, measuring approximately 24m² in area. This element would be entirely clad in slate with a velux style rooflight and glazed skylight inserted on the roofslope. As the rooflight is of a lightweight material and would be partially be obscured from some vantage points at street level by virtue of the position of the surrounding buildings it is considered acceptable as the lightweight material would reduce its perception of bulk and therefore reduce its visibility from the street. It is proposed to be set back approximately 0.8m from the buildings edge on the York Rise elevation and would be visible from the upper floor windows of some properties within Chetwynd Road and Bellgate Mews as well as from the Street. The front elevation window on the York Rise elevation of the extension aligns with the window below; it would be narrower in width and spring from below and behind the parapet. This confirms with our guidance on roof extensions and will ensure the roof extension remains subordinate to the façade below. The existing windows are metal. Moreover many of the windows in the adjoining buildings are metal framed. The proposed is to replace all of the windows with aluminium powder coated windows. The white frames would respond to the white painted timber frames in the area while the materials relates to the adjoining building including the existing modern shopfront at ground floor level to the left of the new entrance. The existing ground floor is made up of an unattractive shopfront with large shutter and shutter housing. Above the entrance is poorly built brick work. The proposal would be to render the ground floor to match the existing adjoining ground floor which forms part of the building. The 'display' window would be enlarged to retain the intimate shopfront feel and provide activity to this part of the street which forms part of the retail frontage.

2.7 A part width roof extension is unusual. It is not considered to be traditional to build a part width roof extension and in this regard it was felt (after trying alternative designs) that a traditionally styled extension which is not scholarly accurate and would appear squeezed into space would not be the correct approach. The proposed design concept has been to provide a contemporary extension which would remain subordinate to the host building and relate to the traditional architecture in the area. This has been achieved by setting the extensions back from the parapet wall on the York Rise elevation. The proposed cladding of the second storey element in slate will allow it to appear as a roof addition. The angled roof would deflect and reduce the perceived bulk and mass of the second storey element whilst providing good quality internal accommodation.

2.8 The design approach is considered to be appropriate given that the site does not lend itself to reproducing a traditional roof/roof extension. Overall the small scale building would be given a much needed facelift. The design would result in a coherent contemporary approach which satisfactorily responds to the character and appearance of the area. The scale of the building would mean it would remain subordinate and therefore not compete with its neighbours forming a minor and neutral part of the streetscene as a whole. It is considered that the proposal serves to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area and is considered to comply with policies CS14, DP24 and DP25 of Camden's LDF.

2.9 An objection has been raised in respect of the loss of a view in the gap between the buildings. The existing gap at first floor level at the application site provides a sense of openness within the street scene. Such a gap adjacent to a corner plot is a common arrangement within the Conservation Area and paragraph 7.25 of the conservation area statement refers to the importance of gaps in York Rise which provide glimpses of trees and gardens over the back gardens from York Rise. Although the trees may be viewed from the upper floors of the buildings facing the site on the opposite side of the road it is not possible to see these views from the street by virtue of the existing parapet wall at first floor level of the application site. The Inspector concluded that the more significant gaps are those in the frontage nearby, at the access to Bellgate Mews and to accommodate the side garden of the corner property in Dartmouth Park Road, in addition to the side

roads themselves. A gap will be maintained between the development site and the rear of buildings on Chetwynd Road and therefore views out to the north-west will be retained. Therefore on balance the partial loss of this view is not considered to be significant and would not constitute a sustainable reason for refusing the application.

3. Amenity

3.1 Objections have been raised in respect of overlooking. It is considered that no overlooking at the rear will be created as a result of the development given the height of the extension at first floor level and the absence of fenestration on the south facing wall. The proposed combination of a rendered wall with no fenestration at second floor level and the glazed part of the extension at second floor level overlooking a staircase/hallway at no.67 Chetwynd Road would also result in no overlooking. It is considered that overlooking and the loss of privacy would be marginal to the properties on the opposite side of the road in York Rise. As previously stated the distance between the application site and the properties located on the opposite side of the road is approximately 5.4m, and is the status quo for the properties along this part of York Rise, and is something to be expected in a densely built up urban environment. In order to alleviate overlooking into the bathroom from the rear upper floor windows of buildings in Chetwynd Road and from the bathroom itself it is recommended that an appropriate condition is attached to the decision notice to ensure that no overlooking occurs by virtue of the rooflight proposed in the rear roof slope of the first floor extension.

3.2 In respect of the previous application that was dismissed on appeal (Ref: 2011/1482/P) the inspector was concerned about the loss of light to the occupiers of no. 67 Chetwynd Road and an adverse impact on outlook to both No. 67 and the neighbouring property at No. 65. Given the smaller scale of the proposed development, the sloping pitched roofs and the fact that the existing gap between the buildings has been partially retained, the impact from the current proposal would be much reduced. Light levels into the second floor bedroom located at the rear of no. 67 Chetwynd Road will not be compromised as a result of the proposal. Daylight into the existing kitchen area at first floor level is currently compromised by virtue of the existing building at no. 33 York Rise. The proposal would not exacerbate the existing situation as a result of the heights of the proposed extensions and their sloping pitched roofs which preserve sight lines between the first floor rear window/door openings at no. 65 and 67 Chetwynd Road and the eaves line of No. 33 York Rise. As such it is considered that there will be no loss of natural sunlight/daylight as a result of the development.

3.3 In respect to adding to the sense of enclosure, the area surrounding the application site is already densely built up. it is acknowledged that the proposal may reduce outlook slightly for nearby occupiers, however given the existing urban grain the proposal is on balance not considered to be of a level which warrants a refusal of the application on this basis. It should be noted that the built form and massing of the extensions proposed are no greater than the previous scheme (ref 2012/1513/P) which was not refused on amenity grounds.

3.4 The proposed bedroom at first floor level is approximately 23m² and complies with the Council's residential development standards in CGP2 chapter 4 para 4.16 which requires the bedroom to be at least 11m². The combined kitchen/dining and living room measures approximately 12.04m² and the overall size of the unit at approximately 56.2m² which also complies with the Council's standards.

3.5 The proposals would result in the enlargement of the terraced area at the rear of no. 67 Chetwynd Road by 1.7m. It is considered that this aspect of the development would not cause any undue harm to existing amenity by virtue of the loss of natural light, overlooking, loss of outlook, loss of privacy and noise and therefore is appropriate.

Recommendation: Grant Planning Permission

Disclaimer

This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please telephone Contact Camden on (020) 7974 4444