

Development Management,  
L B of Camden,  
Town Hall,  
Judd Street,  
London, WC1H 8ND

18<sup>th</sup> April 2015

Your ref. 2015/0271/P

Attn. of Simon Vivers,

Re: 97, Camden Mews, London, NW1 9BU

Planning Statement

Dear Simon,

With regard to the justification for the demolition of the former motor repair garage, I would put forward three strong reasons for consideration:-

1. Firstly, and most importantly, I contend that the former garage use did not fall within the B1 [c] Use Class [light industry], but properly fell within Use Class B2 [general industry]. This is because of the noise and fume generation, for example, the use of air tools and their compressor, horn sounding, engine revving etc. with or without the doors and windows, being closed. All the openings face onto the Mews.  
As you will be aware the planning definition of a B1[c] light industrial use is 'any industrial process, being a use which can be carried out in any residential area without detriment to the amenity of that area by reason of noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, soot, ash, dust or grit'. Obviously, the former use did not fall within that definition.
2. The second reason why the existing building should be demolished concerns the detrimental appearance of the building in the Mews, which is generally characterised by diverse and well-designed modern residential architecture, having 2 main floors with a recessed second floor, which cannot be seen from street level, except obliquely in the long view. It would seem logical to take the opportunity to replace the existing building with a residential development of suitable design, and complimentary to neighbouring developments.
3. The former garage proprietor was very much a one man band, and he wants to move into one of the proposed houses, to enjoy his retirement in a location where he has many friends. He confirms that there were no other interested parties who would take over the business, and that there is another similar motor repair garage further to the south, which is still trading.

In conclusion, and bearing in mind the policies contained in Development Policy 13 and Core Strategy 7, it is contended that the proposed development would significantly improve the use and appearance of the site, particularly for the benefit of adjoining residents, but also in the overall street scene. I do not understand their apparent preference for an industrial use to remain, which apart from the use and visual aspects, would continue to deflate the value of their homes.

I strongly disagree with the statement from the Conservation Officer that ' the proposed design is generic and directly in opposition to the traditional design of the existing industrial building that is part of the Mews' character, incorporating traditional design elements, proportion and features'. Personally, I do not find any historic, or architectural merit in the existing modern roller shutter doors, which are the dominant feature of the garage's front elevation. The other general comments are accepted, but need to be more specific to allow the proposed scheme to be revised.

Kind regards,

Peter Ottery Dip TP MRTPI