

Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

59 Camden Mews
London, NW1

Date: 5 September 2017

Planning application Reference: 2017/4322/P

Proposal: Demolition of existing house and erection of a new two storey house

Summary: On the basis of the information currently available, the application fails to enhance the conservation area and should be rejected. The drawings are confusing and inadequate, the overshadowing of 61 Camden Mews and the issue of an integrated garage all require resolution prior to any further consideration of the application

Comments:

1. The drawings are both confusing and technically inadequate.
 - 1.1. Two proposed front and rear elevations, for example, have been submitted. One set to show the relationship with existing neighbouring properties and the other to compare with possible future neighbouring properties, also see below.
 - 1.2. The proposed ground floor plan states approved planning application references for both 57 and 61 Camden Mews. The latter is correct but application 2016/4986/P for 57 Camden Mews is a lawful development approval for a basement, not a new house.
 - 1.3. The application drawing 14107-300 should be corrected to show the existing property at 61 and existing house at 57 as should Sections: 02, 05 and 09 of the Design and Access Statement where they reference a planning approval for 57 Camden Mews that does not exist.
 - 1.4. There are errors in drawing titles/labelling.
 - 1.4.1. Drawing 14107-302 is incorrectly titled Rear Elevation. It should be Proposed North East Elevation as should title under elevation on same drawing.
 - 1.4.2. Drawing 14107-303 should be corrected to proposed South East Elevation in title and under elevation.

Secretary: Jim Humphris, 88 Agar Grove, NW1 9TL Tel 020 7267 3621

Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

- 1.4.3. Similar comments apply to drawings 14107-307 and 308
- 1.5. The proposed first floor plan builds up to and directly over a staircase window to 61 Camden Mews. The owner of 61 would need to relinquish what appears to be an established right to light for the proposal to work.
- 1.6. There is no long section through the building to indicate floor heights. The staircase as detailed includes 18 risers between ground and first floor, rather more than might be expected in a standard dwelling house storey height.
- 1.7. No details are provided in the drawings of
 - 1.7.1. The openable windows that will be required to habitable rooms.
 - 1.7.2. Window construction materials
 - 1.7.3. Cladding materials
 - 1.7.4. Entrance and garage door materials. How do garage doors open?
 - 1.7.5. The front elevation drawing indicates a balustrade at roof level that is apparently to raise the building line to mirror the non-existent planning approval for no 57. Neither is a balustrade indicated on the plan and it's very arguably unnecessary
- 2. There will be some overshadowing of the neighbouring property as the proposal appears to build directly over first floor SE elevation window to no 61
- 3. A key issue for this proposed development is whether the integrated garage is permissible. Policy T2 of the Camden Local Plan makes clear that all new developments will be car-free. (para 10.18) As the proposal involves the demolition of the existing building and essentially starting afresh, the proposed new building must fall into the category of a new development. If this analysis is correct, which logic dictates that it is, then the inclusion of a garage in the development requires the proposal to be rejected. If on the other hand the scheme is classified as redevelopment, according to para 10.20 of the Camden Local Plan retaining the existing garage provision only becomes permissible if it can be demonstrated that the existing residents are to return to the address when the development is completed. There are two problems here: firstly what distinguishes new development from redevelopment.? If new development is only restricted to greenfield sites on which there has been no prior development, then the potential for new development in Camden will necessarily be limited if not impossible. On the other hand, if this is classified as redevelopment, how will the Council ensure that the original residents will return to the address once the work is completed. Furthermore, how long must

Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

the residents remain in the new building in order to retain an on-site parking permit. Will the right to on-site parking transfer to future residents? As currently written the policy and practice with respect to on-site parking and new builds remains confusing.

4. Whilst this proposal is a significant improvement on the previously rejected application 2015/4564/P, the inadequacies of the drawings, the impact of overshadowing on 61 Camden Mews and the neighbour's right to light and the permissibility or otherwise of on-site parking suggests that these issues should be resolved before planning consent can be considered.



Signed:
David Blagbrough
Chair
Camden Square CAAC

Date: 5 September 2017