

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/5589/P	H B Lake	17 Camden Sq NW1 9UY	25/11/2014 18:11:02	OBJLETTE R	CAMDEN SQUARE CONSERVATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE Hon Sec H B Lake: 17 Camden Sq NW1 9UY Tel: 020 7267 5128 Hughlake0@gmail.com

25 November 2014

CSqCAAC COMMENTS ON APPLICATION REFERENCE:
2014/5589/P - 102 CAMDEN MEWS

This application should be rejected.

The Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CSqCAAC) objects most strongly to this application on a number of grounds:

- The drawings do not allow an adequate view to be taken of the building as it will eventually emerge.
- The ceiling heights shown are not adequate and the realised building would be unacceptably higher than is stated in the proposal
- The third story is overly intrusive as it fronts onto the Mews
- The rear extension reflects an unacceptable permission granted just before the upper end of the Mews was incorporated into the Conservation Area. This should not be allowed to create a precedent to support the current proposal.
- The treatment of the front elevation by painting of old bricks will quickly degrade to the detriment of the Conservation Area and should not be allowed.
- The proposed windows in the rear elevation will cause disturbance and intrusion to neighbours in Cliff Row behind the proposed development.

Details of our objections are given below:

Quality of the Drawings. The drawings are not of an acceptable standard. As in the previous 2012 application for this site, the elevations presented in the drawings continue to have many elements that are little more than schematic. They provide no indication of how or whether windows would open and show no copings, window sills, etc.

Apart from this, the North pointers on all the plans confusingly, actually point South!

Height on to Camden Mews. The external heights shown for the front elevation are drawn to positively relate to Nos. 96– 100A to the SW and No. 104 to the NE of the site. In our view, a third storey (2nd floor) to Nos. 96-100A. would not have been permitted had the Conservation Area been extended to cover this area a year earlier. This anomaly should not be allowed to create a precedent to support the current proposal.

CSqCA Policy Documents. Here follows a description of that development in the updated Camden Square Conservation Area Gazetteer (acknowledged by Camden Planning in July 2011 although still awaiting adoption):

“Nos. 96-100a form a terrace of four live-work houses, approved just before the Conservation Area was extended at the end of 2002. Although the white-painted facades have imaginative elements, the detailing is poor and the flat-rendered first floor projections have rather too large a scale for the context. It would appear that these overlarge rendered planes were an attempt to camouflage the third

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>storey which is hardly set back from street or from the rear elevation facing the back of Cliff Studios [see 'Cliff Road']. This practically complete second floor, including rear-facing windows has created problems of privacy for residents of Cliff Studios. There was no precedent for three- storey buildings on the south-east side of this stretch of the Camden Mews, and this development compromises the hierarchy between low mews structures and higher buildings in the main streets adjacent, espoused in the Conservation Area Statement.”</p> <p>Further, the Camden Square Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy, adopted in 2011, also warns against the type of three-storey development proposed:</p> <p>“Recent development at the top end towards York Way has three storeys, is clearly visible, and is damaging as it overbears the mews.”</p> <p>The marginal recessing of the proposed second floor accommodation would be inadequate to avoid these unacceptable features of the proposal.</p> <p>In fact, it is considered that the scheme would actually reinforce the rhythm of the Mews and would be a positive contribution. if not for the unacceptable additional height,</p> <p>Materials and Appearance. The proposed retention of a what appears to be a replacement elevation in cracked, painted brickwork would not contribute positively to the Mews. Painted brickwork usually becomes untidy within a couple of years and brickwork repairs are usually difficult to conceal in a consistent painted finish. In practice, we have found a number of external walls identified to be retained as a planning stipulation end up being rebuilt without any enforcement action. In this case, a new unpainted brick elevation would be more sensitive and appropriate and should be insisted upon.</p> <p>Overlooking. Originally, this side of the Mews had no back-facing windows, as the buildings were built up to the gardens of the main houses. The rear windows in this proposal would seriously harm the privacy of the residents of Cliff Studios. The fact that the Studios have a communal garden gives no right to adjacent buildings to address it as if it were a public space.</p> <p>Serious problems have resulted from the overlooking rear windows of 96-100A Camden Mews, with the CAAC being notified that the residents of both the Studios and the new houses were uncomfortable about the overlooking, and had to work out ways of screening the windows. In addition, the proposed large roof terrace at 2nd floor level would further reduce the privacy of the Cliff Studios garden.</p> <p>Overshadowing . A three-storey building, as proposed would harmfully overshadow the buildings on the opposite (NW) side of the narrow Mews.</p> <p>The light pollution from rear windows would harm enjoyment of the Cliff Studios garden, as could noise if any of the rear windows were openable.</p> <p>Overall Plan – Although the floor plan in general is good, the sections as shown raise significant issues. The ceiling heights of both floors of the ‘retained’ building have been reduced, thus casting doubt on whether much of the original structure would be retained. In any case, it is deceptive to claim that the first floor side windows could be retained, as they would extend above the roof.</p> <p>Proposed Sections A & B conflict with each other in this respect, and Section B also shows an impossible top to the brickwork over the windows, with no coping or roof edge below the glass balustrade. In numerous respects, the scheme would inevitably be built differently from the way it is drawn. As we have frequently found, this application shows very low floor-to-ceiling heights. The first floor ceilings scale 2200mm and the second floor 2100.</p> <p>More minor concerns also exist, such as the lack of rubbish bin storage.</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>This proposal should be rejected.</p> <p>Taken in isolation, the general style of the proposal would potentially enhance the Conservation Area but the CSqCAAC strongly opposes this application, primarily because of its excessive height is inappropriate for its mews position. Also, for the proposed widows and terrace at the rear, which overlook neighbours to the rear. Fundamentally, however, it must be rejected because of inadequate detail presented in the drawings and the likelihood that the constructed building would look quite different from that drawn.</p> <p>Policy Action by Camden Planning Department</p> <p>As with the 2012 application for this site, this application suffers from two common failures which Camden Planning are in a position to influence:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. For additional floors in height-sensitive positions, ensure that very low ceiling heights are questioned. Actual construction is often taller than drawn.2. Ensure adequate information is provided to establish whether detailing when realised is likely to be satisfactory. <p>End</p>
