

Development Control - Planning Solutions Team
London Borough of Camden
Attn: Ben Farrant

24 August 2018

Dear Mr Farrant

APPLICATION REF. 2017/5303/P - 157 York Way, N7 - by e-mail

I would like to make the following comments on this application:

1. I support the renovation of this property to be more appropriate for current needs.
2. Rear extensions in the Camden Square Conservation Area should follow Camden guidelines and be subservient to the original structure. The proposed rear extensions at every floor level would dominate it, leaving very little of the original rear elevation visible.
3. Rhythm: The building forms part of an 1850s terrace with part-width 'closet-wing' extensions at basement, upper ground and first floor levels. This format remains for Nos. 157-163. The garden of No. 165 was filled with a commercial structure many decades ago, before current planning regulations. No. 155 adjacent was rebuilt several years ago; its rear elevation respects the projection of the extensions to the rest of the terrace. Significantly, the NW bay of No. 155's rear elevation, intended to step down to better relate to the height of the 'closet wings' to No. 157 etc., has been built about 900mm higher than the approved planning drawings. In this proposal, the lower two storeys topped by external staircase with parapet project beyond the consistent original rear building line. Failure to respect this rhythm would be harmful to the terrace.
4. The proposed infill and additionally-projecting closet-wing extensions at basement and upper ground floor level would appreciably reduce the garden area which becomes more important as the residential use increases. More open area for planting would also benefit the local environment.
5. Apart from the excessive bulk of the proposed extensions, some specific elements should be reconsidered.
 - 5.1 An external staircase at quite a high level can be rather dominant and feel visually intrusive.
 - 5.2 Inadequate information is given about windows. No application form appears on Camden's website, so all information comes from the plans and design statement. Currently the windows are uPVC in a range of casement formats. The drawings state only 'white windows to match existing' (which implies uPVC casements), while the design statement says the windows will 'revert to original sash designs'. The drawings should state that the windows will be sliding timber sash type.
 - 5.3 The current lintels are of tapered bricks. In the proposed drawings, the lintels are labelled 'to match existing' but drawn as straight soldier bricks. As the overall design of the extensions aims to be in the style of the original building, tapered brick lintels would be more appropriate.

On the basis of these points, I consider that the current application would be harmful and is therefore unacceptable. I hope that a revised plan will soon be agreed which better balances the applicant's wishes with providing good-quality accommodation and supporting the aims of the Conservation Area.

Yours sincerely

Dale Loth