

Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

181 183 York Way and 282A Camden Road
London

Date: 24 November 2017

Planning application Reference: 2017/3675/P

Proposal: Construction of roof extension and 3 storey rear extension to provide 5 x 1 bedroom self-contained flats and external alterations including the formation of steps to corner retail unit, provision of 2 new windows to 1st & 2nd floor corner elevation to replace existing blank window features, construction of boundary wall at corner and along Camden Road frontage in place of existing car parking spaces and associated removal of 4 car parking spaces/hardstanding.

Summary: The application has a number of significant deficiencies which fail either to maintain or enhance the conservation area. Until these are resolved, the application should be rejected

Comments:

1. The drawings are technically inadequate
 - 1.1. Further elevational and sectional information is required.
 - 1.1.1. It is unclear from the drawings what the side elevation of the neighbouring building at number 282 Camden Road is like.
 - 1.1.2. On the plan there are two recesses, but in reality there are 2 x chimney breasts projecting.
 - 1.1.3. The proposed extension will leave a small, inaccessible gap between the buildings.
 - 1.2. The neighbouring building at number 179 York Way is not shown on the plans or elevations, and therefore the impact of the proposed extension cannot be assessed against this.
 - 1.3. There are small patios proposed to the three flats in the extension
 - 1.3.1. At ground floor level this would be a small, airless space enclosed on all sides and overhead by the terrace above



Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

- 1.3.2. It is not possible to tell the nature of this space from the drawings provided.
 - 1.4. There is a discrepancy in the number of existing and proposed units as described on the application form.
 - 1.4.1. Looking at the existing plans, there appear to be 4 x 3 bedroom flats (described as 2 bed flats on the application form).
 - 1.4.2. The proposed plans show 5 x 1 bed flats (3 in the extension and 2 in the roof extension) plus 4 x 2 bed flats (previously 3 bed flats but rearranged to make more generous 2 beds).

The application is therefore inaccurate in stating that there are 4 existing 2 bed and 5 proposed 1 bed when there are in fact a total of 9 flats (5 x 1 bed and 4 x 2 bed) in the final scheme.
2. The height and volume of the proposal in relation to neighbouring buildings give concern
 - 2.1. The proposed top floor, 'mansard' type roof extension to the main building, although set behind the existing parapet, still dominates in the small views provided in the design access statement. These views are shown as "existing" and "proposed" but are not from the same viewpoint so do not offer a direct comparison.
 - 2.2. The roof extension further erodes consistency in York Way and runs counter to Camden's established position of rejecting applications for roof extensions in this terrace. Moreover, any roof extension over the part of the structure projecting in front of the Camden Road frontage would be doubly inappropriate.
 - 2.3. Whilst mimicking a mansard-type roof construction, the metal-clad construction is entirely vertical giving a boxy appearance to all elevations.
 - 2.4. Comparisons are drawn with the building diagonally opposite (outside the conservation area and in Islington borough), claiming to be a preferable version, however mimicking the boxy top storey is not a favourable precedent to follow.
 - 2.5. It should also be noted that the Islington development, by allowing an 'extra' storey, even though the consistent setback in Camden Road was maintained, significantly damaged the streetscape. At the time the architects argued somewhat audaciously that changing the cladding of the top storey to pale blue panels would make it blend in with the sky a claim which, given the resulting structure, beggars belief.



Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

3. The proposed set-back rear infill extension 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.
 4. More information on the materials, window colour and a coloured elevation would aid assessment. There is no reference to the proposed materials in the application apart from describing the cladding as mid-grey zinc and dark-grey zinc and the metal windows as powder-coated (no colour specified).
 5. More information is required in relation to the patios to avoid a totally enclosed space at ground floor level.
 6. Although a daylight assessment has been submitted with the application, the poor quality of the scan makes it impossible to assess the block model diagrams provided within this.
 7. The removal of existing car parking spaces (specified as to remain under a previous planning condition) would be acceptable so long as a Car-Free Agreement for the development is put in place – as per Camden policy.
 8. Although the rearrangement of the internal planning of the existing flats results in an improvement in the quality of the spaces it should be noted that
 - 8.1. The proposed extension results in a reduction in quality of light and aspect to bedroom 2 in flat 2 on the first floor of the host building - where previously this room had large sash windows looking out over flat roof and open space beyond, it now has a blank brick wall some 2m opposite.
 - 8.2. The rear patios to the extension flats are of questionable quality.
 9. The current proposal has a number of significant deficiencies
 - 9.1. The mansard type roof extension is inappropriate
 - 9.2. There are issues with the set-back rear infill extension
 - 9.3. The negative impact of the development on adjacent buildings – 282 Camden Road and 179 York Way
 - 9.4. Lack of information about the proposed materials
- Until these are resolved, the application should be rejected.



Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

10. To assist in this process, it is noted that there is information contained within the design and access statement and other supporting reports to suggest that a 3D massing model and photomontages have been produced. It is suggested that this information should be submitted at a sufficiently large scale and in colour, to assess the impact of the scheme. Existing and proposed views should be from the same viewpoint for ease of comparison.



Signed:
David Blagbrough
Chair
Camden Square CAAC

Date: 24 November 2017

