

**35 CONWAY STREET
LONDON, W1T 6BW**

APPEAL

The permission we are requesting is permission that is required and necessary to meet the need for blue collar accommodation in the area, not high-end property i.e penthouses. Our property provides homes for key workers, teachers, trainee doctors, architects, nurses, students, tradesmen and pensioners at affordable prices in central London.

We know there is a high demand for this type of housing from our neighbours All Souls Clubhouse (Church of England Society) in 141 Cleveland Street, London, W1T 6QG who have a long list of applicants looking for affordable housing in the area.

What we are requesting is a common sense, practical and straightforward long-term solution to an ongoing problem. We have the space, availability and know-how of what is needed. Our building needs radical investment in restoring the appearance of the building specifically the external elevations and fenestrations.

Our family have lived and worked in the local parish for 4 generations and we have owned 35 Conway Street, London, W1T 6BW for 15 years. This is not a short-term money-making exercise, we are aiming to provide homes on a long-term basis for generations to come. An approval would enable our family name and history to live on in the area. We are worried about the area losing its identity with the decline in affordable homes for blue collar working people.

This will not solve the housing crisis but we are looking to use our potential to go some way in easing that strain. Our residents would be working or studying within the area and therefore we would be providing car-free housing which would benefit the environment in line with policies T1, T2 and A1 of the Camden Local Plan (2017).

Our approach from the start was intended to be open and flexible to any input and conditions from the local authority as underlined in our design and access statement. No discussions were forthcoming or available.

On being told the council had objections to the design we said we would immediately change the design but we were then told by the case officer that there were objections to the use. The council then refused any further discussions. Not only would we have modified the design but we would have reduced the use to one flat. This would allow sufficient floorspace for a high-quality residential accommodation.

The overall height of the roof size is 2.7 metres and therefore should be more than adequate height and would be enough to include the latest best vacuum-packed insulation and frame. The roof sizes are made up of roof void and external space. It is 2.2m from roof ashfelt to top of brick work and 0.55m from ashfelt to third floor ceiling. Our structural engineers will be able to provide necessary calculations to meet building regulations if required by the council. We are prepared to use split pane period style fenestration and we had wished to discuss fenestration and design.

From No. 35 Conway Street onwards, there are many roof extensions and practically no original roof materials specifically No. 23 and No. 25 have mansard roof extension. Also, there are double roof extensions to No.19-21. No. 35's roof itself is not comparable to the adjoining London roofs of Warren Street. We feel that the building and environment would considerably benefit from fenestration improvements in the proposals. The exterior is a stark and bleak reminder of a 'modern' post war conversion that detracts from its surroundings. The upper floors of the building are an eye sore and there is a clear evident room for improvement.

The existing small roof sections are unlike any others on the corners of Conway Street and their lead ridge copings are quite coarse leading us to consider these roof forms a part of what we presume to be the post war conversion of No. 35's upper floors into ensuite bedsits. All roofs on this side of Conway Street bar two have had their original roof materials replaced by modern ones as shown in satellite photographs. We would if thought desirable and required pull it back from the Warren Street side to reduce its bulk and that as a standard mansard proportions design commensurate with those nearby, previously mentioned, nearby in Nos. 23 & 25 Conway Street. The heights are quite feasible with comparison to the properties mentioned.

We feel that the exterior of No. 35 suffers greatly from mild steel windows and that the exterior gold leaf signage of The Dairy could be renovated to its original condition given sufficient investment. Much has been made of the history of these particular family-run dairies in the listing and such could be given better explanation on the premises to benefit the local area.

The main points at issue seem, though, to revolve around design elements that are fairly simple in terms of Camden council recommended split pane fenestration and form. We feel that a critique could be better explained rather than commented on. In terms of construction we have always considered a lightweight frame for consideration in the building control process, one covered of grey slates as stated, to match others in Conway Street mansard extensions.

I cannot emphasise enough the need for the approval of this application without sounding repetitive. It would be hugely beneficial if the inspector was able to visit the site in person to get a feel for the surrounding area and what we are requesting. It would be a waste for a building of this potential to not make the most of its use.

We feel that we should be granted permission subject to any conditions and legal agreements as it would benefit all parties involved: planners, neighbours, residents and the community. As mentioned previously, we are totally open to working together with the local authority in achieving the same goal on providing affordable housing and keeping hold of our heritage and the communities identities.