
From: Meynell, Charlotte
Sent: 18 January 2021 11:54
To: Planning
Subject: FW: 248-250 Camden Road -SC - m3/TRIM - 21/01/2021 - Consultation Response

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi,

Please can the below email be uploaded to M3 and Trim as a consultation response to 2020/3737/P.

Thanks,

Charlotte Meynell
Senior Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 2598



The majority of Council staff are continuing to work at home through remote, secure access to our systems. Where possible please communicate with us by telephone or email.

From: Sophie Adams [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 January 2021 16:59
To: Meynell, Charlotte <Charlotte.Meynell@camden.gov.uk>
Cc: Charlie Round [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: 248-250 Camden Road

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Charlotte,

We hope this email finds you well and safe. We have just gone on to the application website and noticed there have been additional documents uploaded that we had totally missed with the holiday period. We had thought that given the level of objections that the residents would be made aware of any changes to the proposal but as a misunderstanding we hope you will still be able to accept our comments on the new drawings:

1931-RCK- ZZ-XX-DR-A-8202 (north east and south west elevations) as proposed revised
1931-RCK-ZZ-XX-DR-A-8204 (Bay studies) as proposed revised
1931-RCK-ZZ-XX-DR-A- 8201 (South East elevation) as proposed revised

The revised drawings, or recent amendments to the existing design- it is very hard to tell, do not mitigate the inherent flaws of the scheme in terms of 1) its height and mass that is totally out of character with neighbouring properties and dwarfs the low build mews behind, 2) proximity to neighbouring buildings and subsequent overlooking created by not only these stairways (within 11m rather than the 18m minimum as outlined by camden council which is also states is only relevant when buildings are the same height and needs to be adjusted in differing topography like with 248-250 and the low build mews behind) but also the balconies which are designed for residents to use socially and look out onto the gardens and community room below.

We are deeply concerned that rather than address the serious issues that the design poses there is an attempt to bluff away concerns from a gardening rather than planning perspective. 'defensive planting' (as proposed between the rear of our property and the proposed community room), and some form of mesh screening with planting over the staircase does not mitigate wider issues of overlooking submitted in our original objections. If actually maintained, as assumed in the proposal, it still creates privacy issues and leads to an uncomfortable feeling when we can hear residents in Camden road and be seen by them in our houses and outdoor spaces but cannot ourselves see? We are keen to be realistic, living walls are incredibly time consuming and costly to maintain. I see countless examples around London from council buildings to grand houses where they have been left to wither and die as not properly maintained. If this is the case we are left with a visually unattractive see through mesh and the same issues of overlooking. The stairways are too close and we welcome genuine attempts to resolve this concern. The 'green-wash' is too dependent on variable factors to be a sound solution to the issue of proximity and overlooking.

We are also keen to express that the proposed defensive planting between 99 and the community room is not a solution to our security concern regarding the newly formed corridor that would be hidden from view from the staff and activity and hub of the main building, creating a potential hotspot for people doing things they did not want to be seen. We note that the height of the community room has been sunken slightly further since the initial zoom meeting when 99 expressed a right to light concern. Then defensive planting was proposed to mitigate our security concern. Such defensive planting heightens our right to light concern, if plants were actually a deterrent, they would need to be dense and thick and therefore block the light to the rear ground floor windows of 99.

We very much hope our concerns will be addressed with concrete alternatives and solutions. We are disappointed and keen to learn why gardening techniques are being used to bat away genuine concerns that appear to cause conflict with existing policy? We see many cases where planning applications are rejected for reasons such as bulk and design, out of character with the conservation area etc. We would like to highlight below two applications within the area that have been refused very recently as noted below with the reasons:

282 Camden Road NW1 9AB
Planning Refused: 22.12.2020
Application number: 2020/4576/P
Case Officer: Joshua Ogunleye
Reason:

The proposed first floor rear extension, by reason of its location, bulk and design, would appear as a visually obtrusive and incongruous addition on the property which would harm the character of the host building, the uniformity of the group of properties along this part of Camden Road and the character and appearance of Camden Square conservation Area, contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017

9 Cliff Road NW1 9AN
Planning Refused: 27.12.2020
Application number: 2020/5142/P
Case Officer: Kristina Smith
Reason:

The proposed roof extension, by reason of its bulk, form, design and location on an unimpaired roofline, would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host building, its wider building group within Cliff Road and the Camden Square Conservation Area, contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the Camden Local Plan 2017

The above reasons for refusal are in line with the Camden Local Plan and Conservation area. We understand that every applicant is treated the same and equal scrutiny is applied to each application so expect a decision re 248-250 camden road to be consistent.

Kind Regards,

Sophie Adams and Charlie Round

99 Camden Mews
Nw1 9BU