

Development Control - Planning Services
London Borough of Camden
Attn: Hugh Miller

30 June 2017

Dear Mr Miller

APPLICATION REF. 2017/0854/P - 149 York Way, N7 - by e-mail

I would like to make the following comments on this application for an additional storey to the current six-storey building.

Planning permission was granted in 1987 for the current replacement structure. The front parapet aligns with the remaining Victorian buildings at Nos. 151 & 153, But the building was permitted an additional mansard storey. The current proposal to add a further storey above the current mansard is similar to an application refused permission in 2009, except that the front parapet is now shown raised a storey. Effectively, the proposal repeats an attempt to add two storeys to the original height of the structure, which is against Camden's planning policies.

One would assume that this repeat application may have been inspired by the granting of permission on appeal for a new block of flats at 5&6 Cliff Villas on the other side of the taller self-storage warehouse at 145 York Way. Whatever the merits of that successful appeal, the circumstances are fundamentally different and should not be taken to relate to this application. There, a completely new, larger structure was deemed appropriate by the planning inspector, in that no original buildings remained adjacent, and its neighbouring school and warehouse are both of a larger scale than the remaining pair of mid-Victorian houses. Furthermore, the approved building would still be lower than the warehouse. At 149 York Way, however, the current structure retains the original house form (originally with commercial use at lower levels) and continues the lower scale development in the two adjacent conservation areas. It should also be noted that self-storage warehouse heavily overshadows residential properties in Cliff Road, so its height and mass should not be seen as appropriate in generating further high structures to its northwest.

As this proposal effectively repeats the failed 2009 application, I see no reason that it should be treated differently, and would strongly support its rejection.

Yours sincerely

Dale Loth