

2018/2445/P - 6 Albert Terrace Mews

Agent Response to Advice from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee, dated 4th July and 1st August 2018

Paragraph 1.

The Committee's comment that pre-application guidance with the PHCAAC was "*not sought*" is incorrect.

We very much viewed this application as an opportunity to enhance the character of the conservation area by reinstating many features of this insensitively, and much, altered Victorian mews property. We believed that the PHCAAC could provide invaluable design advice on this, and in particular, for our proposal to clearly define the existing side extension with a new roof profile.

Therefore on 4th May 2018, following our pre-application consultation with Camden, we emailed Richard Simpson, Chairman of the PHCAAC, with the application plans (and a detailed description of the proposal) and offered to meet him at the property. After two further emails Richard kindly responded, by email, on the 9th May and advised,

"Thanks, yes I have it, There's quite a lot to look through. I'll get back to you when I have done so."

Despite two subsequent emails being sent on the 15th May and 23rd May (and a number of voicemails being left) we did not hear back from Richard. We appreciate, of course, that the PHCAAC is a voluntary body and that there may have been a number of very understandable reasons as to why our request may have been sidelined.

However we did have an obligation to submit the application without any further delay and therefore, unfortunately, the application had to be uploaded without the benefit of advice from the PHCAAC.

Paragraph 2.

The advice we received from our pre-application consultation on 25th April 2018 with Camden confirmed that the proposal,

"would comply with policy H3 (Protecting existing homes) as it would not result in the net loss of two or more homes. Such a proposal would not normally require planning permission, however any application for demolition, or alteration and extension, of the mews property, should make it clear in that the proposal is for conversion of no. 6 Albert Terrace Mews to ancillary accommodation".

We have therefore made it clear in our application that the proposal involves conversion to ancillary accommodation.

Just to clarify 6 Albert Terrace contains five bedrooms and the owners are a young family of six. They therefore, not unreasonably, require the application property to provide guest accommodation for visiting family and friends.

Paragraphs 3 and 4.

We disagree with the PHCAAC premise that the application produces a “*cumulative loss*” of residential units for the following reasons:

- a. The principle fact is that 6 Albert Terrace Mews and 6 Albert Terrace are separate properties, under separate title, with independent planning histories from each other. Specifically, we do not believe a 2003 consent (PEX0300139/P) at a separate property, namely 6 Albert Terrace, reinstating that property to a single family dwelling (which we assume complied with housing policy at the time) can subsequently be engaged to prejudice the current application at 6 Albert Terrace Mews, on the basis that housing policy may have changed. In effect it would be attempting to (i) utilise current housing policy to re-evaluate a 15-year old consent and (ii) apply this evaluation to an separate property both of which would not appear to be valid due process.
- b. Furthermore CPG Housing (Interim) March 2018 states the “*cumulative loss*” of units focuses on changes “*in the same apartment or flat building, or in the same sub-divided town house*” and 6 Albert Terrace Mews, being a separate mews property, is neither.
- c. It is also our understanding that the planning process is based on the guiding principle that each application must be assessed on it's own merits.
- d. As highlighted in paragraph 2 above Camden, the statutory authority in this matter, has already confirmed that the conversion to ancillary accommodation complies with policy H3.

Paragraph 5.

We were not aware that a Construction Management Plan (CMP) was specifically required for this application but are happy to take advice from Camden and, of course, would action that advice as required.

In any case, if this application is approved, we are committed to minimising the impact of the construction process. Pursuant of this an associated application for this property, currently pending registration, is accompanied by a robust CMP which demonstrates how impacts from the movement of goods and materials will be minimised during the construction process. It also demonstrates that implementing the scheme would not harm local transport routes. If approved, this CMP would be an enforceable document.

Notwithstanding the above comments, we would still very much welcome design feedback from the PHCAAC on the exterior proposals to ensure that all the proposals would best serve the wider Conservation Area. To that end I would be very happy to meet Richard and/or members of the PHCAAC during the course of this application. We do feel that this is a unique opportunity to reinstate, and positively enhance, the exterior of the application property. In that regard, we look forward to hearing from the PHCAAC.

A copy of this response has been sent to Elaine Quigley, the application's Planning Officer, and to Richard Simpson, Chairman of the PHCAAC.

We trust these comments are of assistance.

Yours faithfully

Humphrey Kelsey
12th August 2018