

## Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

157 York Way  
London  
N7 9LN

**Date:** 3 September 2018

**Planning application Reference:** 2017/5303/P

**Proposal:** Formation of 1 x 2 bed duplex at ground and basement levels; rear extension at basement, first and second floor levels; excavation to rear of basement; formation of front lightwell

**Summary:** Concerns over bulk, privacy, possible noise and air and light pollution, access and quality of residential provision, dominate a proposal that as consequence fails to enhance the conservation area. We strongly recommend that the proposed development be rejected.

### Comments:

1. There appears to be an inconsistency with the third floor existing plan.
  - 1.1. The extension perimeter line does not reflect that on the other floors.
2. The height and volume of the proposal do not appear appropriate in relation to neighbouring buildings.
  - 2.1. As well as further infilling of the plan at basement and ground floor levels, the proposal also extends at second floor level, increasing the bulk at the rear significantly at high level.
3. The proposal fails to maintain levels of privacy to be expected in a densely-knit urban environment.
  - 3.1. The rear garden for flat 2 overlooks the lower terrace of flat 1, which is at basement level.
  - 3.2. The access stairs for flat 2 to reach their garden also pass alongside the basement terrace for flat 1, providing further overlooking opportunity.
  - 3.3. The basement terrace of flat 1 is enclosed on two sides by walls ranging from approx. 3m to 6.5m in height which could result in an oppressive space. Coupled with the overlooking issue, this amenity space appears to be of limited value.
4. Although a daylight and sunlight assessment has been submitted which concludes that levels are acceptable this conclusion appears to stretch the notion of acceptability just a little too far

## Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

- 4.1. The living areas of Flat 1 are located at basement level overlooking previously described terrace, so the aspect is less than ideal.
5. No specific details for landscaping the garden or terrace areas - already reduced in size by the bulk of the proposed extensions - have been provided. However it should be noted that
  - 5.1. The lower terrace for flat 1 is indicated as entirely paved with no planted areas;
  - 5.2. The garden to flat 2 shows a paved area, plus blank space which has not been designated as a planted area.
6. The proposed mix of uses (shop at front to ground and basement, with residential to rear and above) appears appropriate and in keeping with neighbouring buildings. However, the quality of residential provision must be called into question.
  - 6.1. The single aspect flat 1 located at basement and ground levels appears to be a gloomy and fragmented space, with the main bathroom located on a different floor from the bedrooms and with living spaces subterranean
7. In the absence of any documentation concerning the proposed class of use (A1 or A3) and hours of work, there may be an issue of noise, light and air pollution, which would impact on the residents of the flat.
8. The current shop and residential unit above appear to be in a state of disrepair, and it could be argued that redevelopment would certainly be an improvement. However this very much depends on the quality of the redevelopment, which in this case is highly questionable
  - 8.1. The internal planning of both the residential units has suffered at the expense of trying to maximise the number of bedrooms for each. The result is a lack of quality space.
9. There are significant concerns over the quality and technical viability of the internal layout
  - 9.1. All bedrooms are of a minimum size for double/twin room;
  - 9.2. Flat 2 has a combined living//dining/kitchen area of approximately 28 sq m for 6 persons. The London Housing Design Guide recommends 34 sqm (for new flats) with two living spaces (i.e. living room and kitchen/dining separately) for units of three or more bedrooms.
  - 9.3. The cycle storage indicated does not seem feasibly located.
    - 9.3.1. Flat 1 would need to carry through the ground floor entrance hall, down winding stairs, through living area and out to terrace beyond.
    - 9.3.2. Flat 2 would require carrying up the access stairs, through the flat and then down the outside stairs to reach the garden.
10. The proposal is a disappointing example of trying to cram too much into the existing site A sufficiently large 4 bedroom flat could be provided at the upper levels without the need for an extension at second floor level, which adds to the bulk of the building. It should also be noted that the additional basement excavation would not be welcomed by neighbours. Concerns

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

over bulk, privacy, noise, air and light pollution, access and quality and technical viability of residential provision, dominate a proposal that as a consequence fails to enhance the conservation area. We strongly recommend that the proposed development be rejected.



**Signed:**

David Blagbrough  
Chair  
Camden Square CAAC

**Date** 3 September 2018