

From: McCarthy, Mark [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 June 2015 18:13
To: Young, Tony
Cc: Gill Scott
Subject: 68a-74a Rochester Place - 2015/3286/P

Dear Mr Young

I wrote on 10 April 2015 by email to Mr S Vivers on application 2014/7974/P with the following text:

Dear Mr Vivers

I wish to object on behalf of South Kentish Town CAAC for Rochester Conservation Area wherein this properties lies.

The Conservation Area is not listed in Consultees on the web page and was not informed of this proposal, contrary to Camden's consultation policies, and explaining our late submission.

It has been the intent of the Conservation Area, as indicated in the Conservation Area Statement, to maintain the mixed industrial / residential balance of this old mews. The change to residential of the upper floor of this property would be against this intent, which has been upheld in previous decisions nearby in Rochester Place, including 2005/1691/P (at appeal), 9300288, and 2013/3800/P.

Moreover conversion would be contrary to Camden's general policies to maintain industrial premises and sustain employment, such as decision 2011/0833/P, revised to 2012/3293/P.

Camden's draft Local Plan demonstrates sufficient achievement and plans for Camden's prospective housing development requirements, and in other applications Camden has successfully argued that the economic and heritage priorities can be paramount because of this.

Please will you confirm that Camden's intention is to give a full planning decision, and not to go forward as passive Permitted Development through non-determination; and keep me informed of your decisions.

Mark McCarthy
Chair Rochester Conservation Area

I received no reply.

It now transpires (from the presented correspondence) that this application was withdrawn at the Council's advice, and that a further application has been submitted, and registered (2015/3286/P) on 16 June 2015.

Because of that withdrawal, my objection previously fails to be on the web page - as it is essentially the same application, this should be rectified.

The consultees listed are only me, and internal to the Council. There is no consultation indicated with the neighbours. This should be rectified.

The following issues must be addressed:

The applicants have submitted information on transport, flood risk and contamination. The latter fails to have professional assessment, just setting out the terms of the Act, even though the property is designated 'works' on Camden's planning maps and has a substantial industrial history.

The tenancy document provides details of the office lease for the period of two years from 7 January 2011. This is not 'immediately before 30th May 2013' as required by the Act, and it is not shown that the property was in office other use in the subsequent period (7 Jan 2013 - 30 May 2013).

The tenancy document identifies 'part of the first floor shown edged in red in the plan' but does not show the plan. It is not shown that this surface area is the same as the application.

The email of 10 June 2015 states that the applicant has not yet gained any counter-party signatures, so that Section 106 agreement cannot be assured before the decision.

Because on these four points further evidence is required, the existing submission should be rejected as inadequate for decision.

Moreover, there has also been lack of consultation process, as indicated.

Mark McCarthy
South Camden Conservation Committee