
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 March 2022 22:03
To: Matthew Dempsey
Subject: Re: 105 Arlington Road - revised plans

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[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 Matthew,

Many thanks for your detailed reply and apologies for seeking further clarification on this as set out below.

Following discussions at our Committee meeting earlier today members remained of the view that we should formally object to the application unless it is possible to incorporate in the informative to any decision wording that makes it clear that the original additions to the house are not to be treated as precedents (including the large rear extensions and inappropriate mansard / top storey form).

Please see further comments below.

On Friday 11/03/2022 at 11:16 am, Matthew Dempsey wrote:

Dear Luisa and CT CAAC,
[Ref: 2021/5157/P & 2021/5731/L.](#)

Thank you for your e-mail and follow up comments. I have spoken to colleagues about the revised scheme and we are minded to recommend approval.

I have investigated the possibility of requesting biodiverse roof coverings, however senior colleagues advise this is not within the scope of the revised proposed development and therefore we are not able to insist on such an addition.

Understood. This is something that should be considered for future policy perhaps - to ensure that inappropriate extensions are mitigated in future when applicants effectively seek approval retrospectively via a further planning application for subsidiary elements.

I would note that the particular host property along with its immediate neighbours shall not be considered as precedents for the rest of the terrace. It is noted these three properties (nos.103 – 107) have been extended further than others in the vicinity, however their rear extensions increase in depth with each property further from the corner with Delancey Street (up to No.107, where the rear projections reduce in depth); the proposed development would maintain this pattern and is not considered harmful, given the minor addition now proposed.

Conservation colleagues have advised me to add notes to the informative/ report highlighting the particular nature of the proposed 'infill' here specifically so it is not regarded as a precedent for any future applications for rear extensions to Arlington Road, Delancey Street or Albert Street.

The additional infill is not considered to be the main issue here (in view of its diminutive size in relation to the already large existing extensions), and the Committee requests that the informative includes reference to the original extensions which were not given permission prior to being constructed.

For illustration of this point there is a current application at 43 Arlington Road (see 2022/0016/P and 2022/0759/L) which quotes much larger extensions at 41 Arlington Road as a precedent. These were only given permission retrospectively after having been extant for 20 years. This is a good example of how changes that would not have been permitted at the time are used to argue for inappropriate additions / alterations elsewhere, even though permission was only gained retrospectively via further alterations being approved. A lack of any explanation to the approval at 41 enables reference to be made to it without taking the specific history into account which is most unhelpful.

Thank you for noting the erroneous annotation remaining on the revised floor plan re: railings – I shall ask that this is removed.

I would like to know if the CAAC wishes to uphold a formal objection to the revised scheme, as this will affect the decision making process (delegated powers / member's briefing panel), I would be grateful if you could advise by reply? If I don't hear by the end of next week I will assume your objections still stand.

If it is possible to clarify that the proposed informative will include reference to the original inappropriate changes not being seen as a precedent then we will withdraw our objection.

kind regards

Luisa, Anthony and Joanna
CTCAAC

Any queries, please let me know? Thank you.

Kind regards,
Matthew

Matthew Dempsey
Planning Officer

Telephone: 0207 974 3862

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.

On Fri, Mar 11, 2022 at 11:16 AM Matthew Dempsey <Matthew.Dempsey@camden.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Luisa and CT CAAC,

[Ref: 2021/5157/P & 2021/5731/L.](#)

Thank you for your e-mail and follow up comments. I have spoken to colleagues about the revised scheme and we are minded to recommend approval.

I have investigated the possibility of requesting biodiverse roof coverings, however senior colleagues advise this is not within the scope of the revised proposed development and therefore we are not able to insist on such an addition.

I would note that the particular host property along with its immediate neighbours shall not be considered as precedents for the rest of the terrace. It is noted these three properties (nos.103 – 107) have been extended further than others in the vicinity, however their rear extensions increase in depth with each property further from the corner with Delancey Street (up to No.107, where the rear projections reduce in depth); the proposed development would maintain this pattern and is not considered harmful, given the minor addition now proposed.

Conservation colleagues have advised me to add notes to the informative/ report highlighting the particular nature of the proposed 'infill' here specifically so it is not regarded as a precedent for any future applications for rear extensions to Arlington Road, Delancey Street or Albert Street.

Thank you for noting the erroneous annotation remaining on the revised floor plan re: railings – I shall ask that this is removed.

I would like to know if the CAAC wishes to uphold a formal objection to the revised scheme, as this will affect the decision making process (delegated powers / member's briefing panel), I would be grateful if you could advise by reply? If I don't hear by the end of next week I will assume your objections still stand.

Any queries, please let me know? Thank you.

Kind regards,

Matthew

Matthew Dempsey
Planning Officer

Telephone: 0207 974 3862



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: CTCAAC Chair [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 March 2022 23:40
To: Matthew Dempsey <Matthew.Dempsey@Camden.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: 105 Arlington Road - revised plans

[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 Matthew,

Thanks for forwarding the revised scheme.

Whilst we welcome the removal of the proposed railings at 1st and 2nd floor level (noting that there remains a reference to railings on the first floor plan which should be redacted), the Committee remains concerned that the very large extent of flat roofing should be mitigated in view of the current climate emergency and a general loss of biodiversity. The provision of a green or brown roof at second floor level would provide a better view from the top floor and would also ensure that this roof is not put to informal use. Is it possible to seek such mitigation?

We also remain very concerned that giving consent for this scheme effectively approves the existing excessively large rear extensions, and this will then be used by other applicants to argue

the case for similar additions nearby. Is there some way that this specific point can be addressed should the Council be minded to give permission? If any such consent notes that this is not to be considered a precedent in view of planning history circumstances could that carry any weight?

kind regards

Luisa

On Tue, Mar 8, 2022 at 2:57 PM Matthew Dempsey <Matthew.Dempsey@camden.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear CT CAAC,

Thank you for your comments in relation to the application for planning permission and listed building consent at 105 Arlington Road.

Ref: 2021/5157/P & 2021/5731/L.

I have advised the applicant of your objection and they have revised the plans in response – please see attached.

All supporting documents can be viewed here:

[Search for planning applications - Camden Council](#)

I would be grateful if you could take a look at the revised plans and let me know if you have any further comment to make? Thank you.

Any queries, please let me know? Thank you.

Kind regards,

Matthew

Matthew Dempsey
Planning Officer
Supporting Communities
London Borough of Camden

Telephone: 0207 974 3862
Web: camden.gov.uk

5 Pancras Square
London N1C 4AG

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.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and

delete the material from your computer. See our new Privacy Notice [here](#) which tells you how we store and process the data we hold about you and residents.

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. See our new Privacy Notice [here](#) which tells you how we store and process the data we hold about you and residents.