

Our Ref: 19348/KM  
Your Ref: PP-09921129  
Email: [kmatthews@firstplan.co.uk](mailto:kmatthews@firstplan.co.uk)  
Date: 21 June 2021

Planning Department  
London Borough of Camden  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, 5 Pancras Square  
c/o Town Hall, Judd Street  
London WC1H 9JE

Dear Sir/Madam,

**MINOR MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO PLANNING PERMISSION REF: 2017/6788/P  
WORKSHOP REAR OF 38-52 FORTRESS ROAD, FORTRESS GROVE, LONDON, NW5 2HB**

We are writing to apply for a minor material amendment to the above approval under Section 73 of Town and Country Planning Act 1990, in order to enable some corrections to how the height of the existing east elevation parapet to Studio B and the ground level and roofline of 1 Railey Mews were shown in the approved application drawings.

The changes do not propose to increase the overall height of the building, which has been designed to a specific datum level. However, due to limited access to the landlocked east boundary some assumptions were made about the existing east elevation and the neighbouring ground level which have now been found to be inaccurate. This application therefore seeks to correct this.

The following documents have been submitted in support of this application:

- Completed Application Forms;
- Site Location Plan;
- Under Construction Section, ref: 1014-UC-B-S-02 PL1
- Existing East Elevation (Railey Mews), ref: 1014-EX-B-E-10 PL3
- Existing South Elevation (Fortess Grove), ref: 1014-EX-B-E-11 PL3
- Existing West Elevation, ref: 1014-EX-B-E-14 PL3
- Proposed Section, ref: 1014-UC-B-S-01 PL4
- Proposed East Elevation (Railey Mews), ref: 1014-EX-B-E-10 PL5
- Proposed South Elevation (Fortess Grove), ref: 1014-EX-B-E-11 PL6
- Proposed North Elevation, ref: 1014-EX-B-E-13 PL PL4
- GIA Daylight and Sunlight Addendum dated 18<sup>th</sup> June 2021

Planning permission was granted on the 28<sup>th</sup> January 2019 for the *“Works to depot building (Studio B) comprising increasing height of existing parapet, erection of a single storey roof extension, rear infill extension, external alterations and landscaping of courtyard; provision of UKPN substation and external alterations to Railey Mews”*.

It is now proposed to vary condition 3 of the consent to allow for the corrected plans listed above to supersede the previous versions.

It should be noted that it is not proposed to vary plans 1014-PL-S-B-00; 1014-UC-B-P-00; 1014-UC-B-P-01; 1014-UC-B-P-02; 1014-UC-B-P-RF; 1014-UC-B-S-01; 1014-EX-B-E-13; 1014-PL-B-P-00 REV PL3; 1014-PL-B-P-01; 1014-PL-B-P-02; 1014-PL-B-P-RF REV PL3; 1014-PL-B-S-02 REV PL3; 1014-PL-B-E-12 REV PL3; SK-B-40 REV PL.

It is therefore proposed that condition 3 is varied to read as follows:

*“The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans [1014-PL-S-B-00; 1014-UC-B-P-00; 1014-UC-B-P-01; 1014-UC-B-P-02; 1014-UC-B-P-RF; 1014-UC-B-S-01; 1014-UC-B-S-02 **REV PL1**; 1014- EX-B-E-10 **REV PL3**; 1014-EX-B-E-11 **REV PL3**; 1014-EX-B-E-13; 1014-EX-B-E-14 **REV PL3**; 1014-PL-B-P00 REV PL3; 1014-PL-B-P-01; 1014-PL-B-P-02; 1014-PL-B-P-RF REV PL3; 1014-PL-B-S-01 **REV PL4**; 1014-PL-B-S-02 REV PL3; 1014-PL-B-E-10 **REV PL5**; 1014-PL-B-E-11 **REV PL6**; 1014-PL-B-E-12 REV PL3; 1014-PL-B-E-13 **REV PL4**; SK-B-40 REV PL; Daylight and Sunlight Report (12073), prepared by GIA , dated 20/11/2017; Daylight and Sunlight Report (12073), prepared by GIA , **dated 18/06/2021.**]”*

The proposals under this minor material amendment application seek to correct some discrepancies in terms of how the east elevation has been shown on the existing and proposed plans. For clarity, the changes have been shown in red bubbles.

There will be no change to the actual proposed height of the building, and the general character and appearance of the development will remain the same. There is therefore no harm to the Kentish Town Conservation Area.

In relation to residential amenity, a new addendum to the Daylight and Sunlight Report (12073) has prepared by GIA which shows a slight improvement in NSL compliance compared with the 2018 assessment and a similar level of compliance for VSC and APSH. There is therefore considered to be no material difference in the results.

With regard to sense of enclosure, whilst the existing parapet is approximately one metre lower than was shown on the existing plans and there is a difference in neighbouring ground levels, the proposed height remains the same and should be considered acceptable given the urban location and tight urban grain.

We trust you have sufficient information to enable a positive determination of the minor material amendment application and we look forward to receiving confirmation that the application has been validated. In the meantime, should you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully



KATE MATTHEWS  
Director