2nd Round of pre-application advice: Sept 2019

On Mon, 30 Sep 2019 at 15:03, Sild, Thomas <<u>Thomas.Sild@camden.gov.uk</u>> wrote: Dear Chris

Samir has now left Camden and I have picked up the management of this case.

Rich and I have reviewed the revised scheme with input from the design team.

There has been considerable progress with addressing the rear of the building with the left hand side (viewed from the rear) presenting an appropriate design which responds well to the context of the adjoining houses.

Rear right side roof form

The large box dormer roof form on the right hand side needs further consideration. This appears as an oversized dormer which would not otherwise be policy compliant should it come to us as a householder roof extension. Whilst there are examples of oversized box dormers along Ravenshaw Street these make a negative contribution to the streetscape and shouldn't be replicated here. The ideal solution would be to present the roof as seen on the left hand side however there may be scope to create a softer mansard type roof form here – perhaps with smaller dormer projections on to it.

Privacy screening

The principal overlooking concerns on this site are in relation to views either back to the windows of the existing adjoining houses or to those parts of the neighbouring gardens closest to the ground floor habitable windows. Overlooking/views directly out to the rear, the railway cutting, and down to the proposed new amenity spaces below are of lesser concern and as such there isn't the need for the quantity of privacy screening you are proposing. The high level screen on the left side at ground floor could be dropped, with just a small side section of screen to 1.7m to mitigate views to 21. The right side could be simplified overall in this respect with balconies sited further away from 25 so as to reduce overlooking naturally without the need for elaborate screening solutions that may make the balconies themselves much less appealing as amenity space.

Lightwells

There are concerns that glazing over almost the entire front garden space would create an alien and visually intrusive element to the street, and illumination after dark would serve to exaggerate that. The lightwells should be reduced in projection to around ½ of the front garden depth with a more substantial area of natural landscaping retained alongside the front boundary wall. Metal grill covers would be preferable so long as a satisfactory amount of light can be provided to those bedrooms, otherwise glazing could be considered. Please provide the anticipated ADF scores in due course and we can make further consideration of the quality of accommodation proposed.

If you have any questions on the above, please do not hesitate to contact me. We're keen to work with you on achieving a successful solution.

Kind regards Tom

Thomas Sild MPlan PgDip Planning Officer Supporting Communities London Borough of Camden

Telephone: 020 7974 3686 Web: <u>camden.gov.uk</u> 5 Pancras Square London N1C 4AG

Pre-application dormer design



Final application dormer design reduced in depth



Dormer appeal 3157363 allowed

Appeal Decision

sit made on 10 January 2017 by JP Roberts BSc(Hons), LLB(Hons), MRTPI an Inspector appointed by the Sec Decision date: 2 February 2017 ecretary of State for Co ities and Local Gove

- Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/16/3157363 Flat 1st Floor, 71 Ravenshaw Street, Camden, London NW6 1NP The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission. The appeal is made by Ms Bithhaid Mahony against the decision of the Council of the London Biorough of Camden. The application Ref 2016/0990/P, dated 22 February 2016, was refused by notice dated The development proposed is a loft conversion.

9. The site can also be seen, albeit at speed, from passing trains along the tracks opposite the appeal size. I attach limited weight to such views, as not only are they fleeting, but it is more difficult to identify a sense of place as a passenger unless one is very familiar with the locality. A large residential block lies opposite the site on the other side of the railway tracks, but it is not clear from what I saw whether there are windows to habitable rooms facing the railway lines.

10. Thus, whilst I agree that the dormer would be of poor design, in my view it would have only a very limited impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This small effect, along with the paucity of places from which it could be seen, justifies not rigidly

applying the policies referred to above, as their underlying objective, to protect local character and appearance, would not be ma

11. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the proposal would not result material harm to the character and appearance of the area. Whilst it would conflict with the policies to which I have referred, the particular circumstances of the case justify departing from them.

Decision

The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion at Flat 1st Floor, 71 Ravenshaw Street, Camden, London NW6 1NP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2016/0990/P, dated 22 February 2016, subject to the following conditions: 1.

