

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3675/P	Dale Loth	1 Cliff Road NW1 9AJ	18/11/2017 15:54:44	OBJEMAI L	Dear Madam / Sir

Before commenting on this application, I need to clarify an important aspect of the current structure. Before 1996, the parade of shops in York Way ended at the line of the facades of the houses in Camden Road and there was a garden at the corner. The continuous set-back along Camden Road was a significant unifying feature of the Camden New Town development starting about 1840. It is most unfortunate that the current structure which destroys that consistency was ever granted planning permission, even though at the time it was not within the Camden Square Conservation Area. The poor quality of the existing mock-Victorian structure compounds this.

In my view, two main elements of the current proposal should be changed before any approval should be considered:

1. A 'mansard'-type roof extension would be inappropriate, further eroding consistency in York Way. Camden Planning has previously rejected applications for roof extensions in this terrace. Any roof extension over the part of the structure projecting in front of the Camden Road frontage would be doubly inappropriate. The relatively recent taller structure on the diagonally opposite corner of Camden Road and Brecknock Road (in Islington's Hillmarton Conservation Area) shows the damage done to the streetscape by allowing an 'extra' storey, even though the consistent set-back in Camden Road was maintained. In that case, the architects argued that changing the cladding of the top storey to pale blue panels would make it blend in with the sky. I would question whether anyone viewing the resulting structure would agree with this.

2. If a set-back rear infill extension is considered appropriate, it should not project beyond the unifying line of the Camden Road frontages and should leave a reasonable gap to the Victorian 282 Camden Road, which has always been a detached building. The current proposal with a canted projection would add a further local 'feature' which would compound the harm the current 181-183 York Way structure does to Camden Road and the Conservation Area. In addition, the awkward small gap between the proposed rear extension and 282 Camden Road would cause significant practical problems for maintaining the side elevation of No. 282.

Yours sincerely

Dale Loth AA Dipl RIBA  
Dale Loth Architects

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3675/P	Professor Susan Collins	129 Camden Mews London NW1 9AH	18/11/2017 17:40:47	OBJ	<p>I have a number of key concerns and comments about this proposed development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Whilst I would absolutely welcome more landscaping on Camden Road and this doubtless has the potential to improve the amenity and provide some additional greenery, I am concerned about the loss of parking, and would ask that (as suggested in the docs) that this proposal is only approved on condition that it is a car free development – and that the condition is enforced. The nearest parking would be at the Eastern End of Camden Mews (as there is no street parking on either Camden Road or York Way) which is already at capacity and with five additional flats it is vital that more cars are not introduced to this part of the conservation area.</li> <li>2) Whilst I welcome the proposal for more greenery – can this be enforced? A proposal which was approved at 282 Camden Road a number of years ago was on condition of a green roof. This was finished around six years ago – we are still waiting for the green roof. I have raised this many times with the Council who appear to have done nothing. Can the development be done with the greenery as a planning condition? And can this be enforced?</li> <li>3) Whilst a lot of trouble has been taken to ensure the new developed flats will be protected from excess noise, it would be helpful to know what is being done to protect the neighbours from the noise of 5 new dwellings (including the building work). I was concerned to see two patios included in the plans to the rear of the new apartments. We already suffer considerably from noise from the balconies of the flats in the existing property (especially when there are parties) which have kept us awake at night. And we suffered when the Shisha tent was there so we know that the noise transmits in our direction (noise complaints for both have been documented in the past with the police and the council). So I am concerned if there is a proposal for external outlets to the rear of these (student rental) properties as speaking from experience I can say with all certainty that this would directly affect our amenity, health, mental health and wellbeing. Could the external patios be removed from the proposal please.</li> <li>4) Can there be strict constraints on the hours of building work please to mitigate the disruption to neighbours on all sides of the proposed building.</li> <li>5) It is difficult to comment on the visual qualities of the proposal as the plans are all in drawing form and there are no actual visualisations which give a sense of how the materials will actually look. Mid grey zinc for the roof extension sounds fine – but how will the new rear extension actually look? The proposal is very light on any kind of architectural design or detail and I would be very concerned to see it approved without more to go on. The proposal itself describes the building diagonally opposite as of little architectural merit and with no significant features. I would argue that it lets down the whole area, it looks cheap and temporary and should be used as an example of exactly what not to do. It also happens to lie outside the Camden conservation area unlike this proposed development. It is vital that this proposal which has some merit in providing additional housing and greenery to the area is properly tested in terms of the quality that it will bring. A lot of consideration appears to have been given to planning requirements, constraints and the local context but it will all rest on whether the materials used are ultimately sympathetic and although I am hearing it from the document – it isn't in fact really in there anywhere.</li> </ol>

So these are my key concerns – in summary:

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Needs to be conditional on being a car free development (including for the existing flats)</li><li>- The greenery proposed needs to be a condition of planning and so enforceable</li><li>- Noise considerations in terms of the impact on neighbours needs to be addressed (and the removal from the proposed rear patios in the current proposal)</li><li>- Considerate working hours and practices of any building works please (and not to use the Mews for any building associated vehicles)</li><li>- More architectural detail in terms of actual quality and materials needed before final approvals</li></ul>

---