

## Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

99 Camden Mews  
London  
NW1 9BU

**Date:** 19 November 2017

**Planning application Reference:** 2017/5313/P

**Proposal:** Demolition of existing part 1 storey/part 2 storey dwelling-house and erection of replacement 3 storey dwelling-house with second floor terrace and set back 3rd floor.

**Summary:** Due to the absence of critical information, this application cannot be supported and should be rejected.

**Comments:**

1. The drawings are technically inadequate
  - 1.1. More sections are needed, particularly through the northeastern gable-fronted part of the building where the roof extension is more prominent than in Section A, and through the gaps on either side of the front projecting square central bay, which would show a lack of adequate balustrading.
  - 1.2. More detail is needed for the thin, completely flat roofs to be convincing
  - 1.3. Doors to the refuse and cycle stores which appear in the Ground Floor plan revised 8 November need to be shown on revised front elevations.
  - 1.4. A door would be required to separate the top floor accommodation from the lower parts of the escape stair, but there is enough space to arrange this at first or second floor level.
2. Internally, the room planning is good and the spaces appear generous and well lit.


Secretary: Jim Humphris, 88 Agar Grove, NW1 9TL

## Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

3. We are concerned that the height and volume of the proposal appear inappropriate in relation to neighbouring buildings.
  - 3.1. From the information given, it is difficult to judge how prominent the larger portion of the top storey (behind the front gable) would be from a 1.5M height on the opposite side of Camden Mews.
  - 3.2. The sole diagonal photomontage shows dense planting covering the top storey, and it is beyond planning control to ensure that this appears and is maintained. An angled cross-section would clarify this.
  - 3.3. From the rear, the top storey appears quite dominant, hardly convincing were left pale in the coloured rear elevation although part is set back only 300mm.
4. The scale of the projecting first floor front bay is rather larger than adjacent properties, but there is a variety of scales within the mews as a whole.
5. The recessed central section clad in timber, which appears to be set behind the 'original' brickwork, provides a successful articulation which complements the live
6. The stock brickwork, zinc sheet and Accoya timber are durable materials which support the variety of materials in the mews.
7. The levels of light and direct sun are not maintained and this is unacceptable
  - 7.1. The nearly complete third storey would significantly increase overshadowing of the garden of the hostel behind.
8. The light pollution and loss of privacy through the large windows in the rear elevation would be obtrusive and spoil any sense of privacy for those in the hostel behind
9. The revised ground floor plan includes unusually good, practical provision for bicycles and refuse storage
10. The proposal is critically lacking in specific information
  - 10.1. The rooftop development cannot be built as drawn and more information is needed to establish the true prominence of the top storey.
  - 10.2. The front parapets in Section A-A are only about 800mm high, and 1100mm is required by the Building Regulations. Planting in the roof level gaps around the first floor front square bay obscures the complete absence of balustrades there. These technical requirements would have significant implications on the appearance of the building and it is not enough for Camden Planning to simply say that the requirements of the Building Regulations must be met, as if the required redesign would not be relevant to the Conservation Area.

## **Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee**

- 10.3. Adequate sections and detail must be given about apparently minimal roof structures such as this to show that they are likely to be built as drawn. This is often not the case: roofs end up being built noticeably higher than in the approved planning drawings, and applicants are well aware of how unlikely any enforcement action will be.
11. Until adequate additional information is provided, we cannot support this proposal. We would ask Camden Planning to be sure to notify us when this additional information is provided, to enable us to carry out our statutory duty of commenting on the final application.



**Signed:**  
David Blagbrough  
Chair  
Camden Square CAAC

**Date:** 19 November 2017

