

From: Adam Jones @ Urbanist Architecture

Sent: 03 November 2017 17:30

To: Young, Tony

Cc: naim mustafa

Subject: Response to Comment for COL 4 years Self contained Flat.

Afternoon Tony,

Please find my responses to the comments made by Rochester conservation area. I will respond to them by each point made.

1) The first set of comments *The building is a Camden non-designated heritage asset (Local List no 521).*

It has close proximity (and views) to Rochester, Jeffreys and Kelly Street conservation areas. It stands opposite Kentish Town High Street which has further locally listed buildings.

It views directly to the east towards the site which had a National School serving north Camden Town since the beginning of the nineteenth century;

Adjacent building in Royal College Street, the former pub Black Horse, was refused permission for a roof extension.

All of which do not have any reference to material planning consideration such as; effects on neighbouring properties, amenity space, privacy, noise and disturbance etc have not been addressed or pointed out as the flat complies with all relevant policies in relation to these considerations.

The fact that there are locally listed building in the area has no effect on this Certificate of Lawfulness application along with the views from the property to which conservation areas are nearby. Again, this is not a material planning consideration.

The fact that other developments have been refused, I would kindly point out that each application is assessed on its own merits and cannot be effected by another application. If a roof extension has been refused it is therefore refused on its own merits in terms of design, setting, scale and bulk. Due to the fact that this application does not propose any form of development, but wants to make lawful an **existing** development which has been in more or less continuous use for over 4 years this comment also does not have an effect on this application.

The application seeks a material change which requires planning permission. What was the original (before conversion) floor plan?

What would be the consequent floor plan for the 'other' half of the premises (No 2) which is contingent on the changes proposed for No 2a (one 'room' appears without a door, and there are no bathroom or kitchen facilities shown)?

The application property is within a development that was made within the last 20 years for 'penthouse' flats on the original industrial building. Subdividing these into smaller flats would be contrary to Camden's purpose in the original planning approval, housing balance and policy for high quality residential provision.

It seems that the person(s) writing these comments have not correctly assessed or taken the time to fully comprehend this application and the application type. The application is for a certificate of lawful development. Therefore the property is **existing** and seeks to become lawful by providing all of the relevant documentation. This documentation includes; **Council Tax**, Tenancy Agreements,

Phone Bills, Internet Bills, Utility Bills etc. This shows a clear history of the use of the flat dating back to 2007.

Planning requirements for lawful development do not need to show the surround flats/properties. This is hence why the door is not shown in the adjacent flat. It is for the Local Authority to get a clearer understanding of the layout. Same applies for the kitchen and bathroom. This is further clarification that they did not assess the application properly.

The application has submitted a very large and comprehensive amount of documentation to prove the lawful use of development as a self contained unit. This is a strong application and these comments should not effect the decision by the Council as not a single material planning consideration has been made, nor have the documents been criticised.

Kind Regards

Adam Jones BArch (Hons)

**Architectural Assistant
Urbanist Architecture**