

**Our ref:** Q40227  
**Your ref:** 2019/4998/P  
**Email:** gjbmarkes@gmail.com  
**Date:** 30 March 2020



David Peres da Costa  
5 Pancras Square  
Kings Cross  
London  
N1C 4AG

For the attention of Mr. David Peres da Costa

By email

Dear David

## Response to comments received on application reference 2019/4998/P from the Parkhill Conservation Area Advisory Committee

In September 2019 a minor material amendment application was submitted on behalf of the London Borough of Camden ('the Applicant') to vary design details and the wording of certain conditions attached to planning permission 2014/5840/P as amended by 2015/6696/P.

Following submission of this application, an objection to the application was made by the Parkhill Conservation Area Advisory Committee ('PCAAC').<sup>1</sup> The objection letter as found on the planning register is provided in **Appendix 1** of this letter. The objection requested confirmation of particular details in relation to the Parkhill Conservation Area. The details requested are as follows:

- Highlight where the seven new residential units are located;
- Highlight changes to elevations, materials and design; and
- Highlight all changes to development along boundary with Parkhill Road properties.

This letter will address each point consecutively and provide clarification on where this information is provided within the application pack.

### 1 Highlight where the seven new residential units are located.

The MMA submitted in September 2019 proposes an increase in the number of units delivered from 112 to 119. This is to better respond to the needs of Camden residents for more two-bedroom units. In addition to increasing the delivery of housing, which is in itself a public benefit, these additional seven units ensure that the development is able to remain viable and deliverable. This was achieved through a revision of the floor

---

<sup>1</sup> The response has been signed by the Chair of the Belsize CAAC, though the comment is clearly intended to concern the Parkhill CAAC, and this response is written as such.



plans, unit mix and unit allocation of each of the three buildings (Aspen Court, Aspen Villas and Grafton Terrace). As a result, it is not possible to highlight exactly where the seven additional units are located.

**Table 5** of the **Planning Statement** submitted in support of the application demonstrates how the number of units within each building has changed as a result of the proposals and is recreated below. It shows that Aspen Court and Aspen Villas each contain two additional units and Grafton Terrace three.

**Table 1 - Comparison of unit mix as consented and proposed per building**

	Aspen Court		Aspen Villas		Grafton Terrace	
	Consented	Proposed	Consented	Proposed	Consented	Proposed
<b>1 bedroom</b>	15	13 (-2)	18	22 (+4)	11	8 (-3)
<b>2 bedroom</b>	19	32 (+13)	17	17	9	18 (+9)
<b>3 bedroom</b>	13	6 (-7)	2	0 (-2)	3	2 (-1)
<b>4 bedroom</b>	2	0 (-2)	-	-	-	1 (+1)
<b>5 bedroom</b>	-	-	-	-	3	0 (-3)
<b>Total</b>	49	51 (+2)	37	39 (+2)	26	29 (+3)

For clarity, the footprint of each building has not changed and the buildings have not got taller. In fact, as is detailed in Row 0.7 of the narrative of changes contained in **Appendix E** of the **Design and Access Statement** ('DAS'), each building has been reduced in height as a result of changes to the stair risers (Aspen Court 300mm lower; Aspen Villas 375mm lower; Grafton Terrace 225mm lower).

## 2 Highlight changes to elevations, materials and design

A summary of all the changes is provided in **Section 3** of the **DAS** and a more detailed narrative of the changes proposed to the extant permission is contained in **Appendix E** of the **DAS**. The changes to the design of the development (including elevations and materials) are described further and justified in **paragraphs 4.10 to 4.16** of the **Planning Statement**.

A copy of the plans permitted under the extant consent were submitted with the application alongside updated plans that capture the latest scheme that is proposed as part of the minor material amendment. All proposed plans submitted contain red bubbles that highlight the changes as compared to the extant permission.

The changes to the elevations, materials and design of the scheme ensure that the development will deliver a scheme that meets all current building regulations and standards, and will function effectively over the entirety of its lifetime.

### 3 Highlight all changes to development along boundary with Parkhill Road properties.

The western elevation of Aspen Court is the only part of the development that sits adjacent to the Parkhill Conservation Area boundary and to Parkhill Road. The consented western elevation of Aspen Court is shown in drawing **MPI-P22\_PL03**. The proposed western elevation of Aspen Court is shown in drawing **MPI-P22\_PL12**. Both of these drawings were submitted in support of the MMA application and are furthermore appended to this letter at **Appendix 2** and **Appendix 3** respectively.

The changes to the western elevation of Aspen Court are the same as the changes made across the development. These are:

- Changes to the fenestration of the building in response to the altered unit layout;
- Brickwork has been amended to a similar but alternative pale cream brick (final specification of the material to be agreed with the Council via discharge of planning condition);
- Dark engineering brick base added to the building so that the building will age better;
- The roof cladding is amended from pre-oxidised copper cladding to copper coloured aluminium;
- Slight reduction in the finished floor levels;
- The colour of the window casings have changed from pre-cast concrete to a dark grey to provide elevational relief and stronger vertical linearity; and
- Confirmation of the location of the rainwater downpipes (which are to be of copper coloured metal).

### Conclusion

I trust the above provides you with sufficient information to respond to the objection made by the PCAAC and that you agree that their objection should be disregarded. It is prudent to clarify that the letter received from the PCAAC does not contain any grounds for objection, only a request for further information. This letter aims to point out where this information is provided in the application pack, and provide further clarity in this regard.

Should you need any further assistance please do not hesitate to contact me via email or telephone.

Yours sincerely



Gregory Markes  
Planner



## Appendix 1 – Objection letter from Parkhill Conservation Area Advisory Committee



**Documents attached**

No details entered

**About this form**

Issued by	Contact Camden 5 Pancras Square London N1C 4AG
Form reference	21535593

**Data Protection**

No personal information you have given us will be passed on to third parties for commercial purposes. The Council's policy is that all information will be shared among officers and other agencies where the legal framework allows it, if this will help to improve the service you receive and to develop other services. If you do not wish certain information about you to be exchanged within the Council, you can request that this does not happen.



## Appendix 2 – Consented elevations of Aspen Court



## Appendix 3 – Proposed elevations of Aspen Court