
Subject: Objection. 2022/2374/P - 300 Kentish Town Road

See below, querying why their comments are not on the website. Can you resolve please?

Thanks,

Sofie

From: Richard Porter <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Fwd: Attn: Sofie Fieldsend - Planning Application Ref. 2022/2374/P - 300 Kentish Town Road

Dear Ms. Fieldsend,

I am contacting you regarding the below email I sent on 12/08/22 regarding the above planning application. I wrote the note in respect of a heritage statement submitted during the consultation period by the applicant. I submitted the letter before the official closure of the comments period (Monday 15th August). I note that my comments have not been posted on Camden's planning web portal yet. Can I ask why this is the case? I hope that my comments regarding this document will be considered and my objections noted.

Thank you in advance for your assistance and kind consideration.

Kind regards,

Richard Porter

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Richard Porter <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 12 Aug 2022 at 17:25

Subject: Attn: Sofie Fieldsend - Planning Application Ref. 2022/2374/P - 300 Kentish Town Road

To: Planning <planning@camden.gov.uk>

Attn: Sofie Fieldsend

**Planning Application for 300 Kentish Town Road
Ref. 2022/2374/P**

Dear Ms Fieldsend,

I am writing regarding the above planning application, specifically in response to the recently submitted Heritage Statement PLN 220803. I wish to raise objections to some key statements made in the document, with reference to Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) - Design (January 2021) to support my objections. I will use the same headings used in the submitted statement:

Massing

The recently submitted Heritage Statement says that:

'the proposed works represent a clear enhancement to this site, with the current arrangement being disjointed when read alongside the homogeneous nature of the adjoining townscape. The proposed extension will resolve the current void condition and complete the street elevation, with its height restrained so as to remain subservient to the host building of 300 Kentish Town Road.'

Firstly this statement shows a clear lack of understanding of the historic fabric and massing in the conservation area. The 'void condition' that is referred to as if it is an anomaly is in fact the historic pattern of the area. The primary building (298-300 Kentish Town Road) faces the main thoroughfare, and would always have had open garden space behind, possibly populated with out-buildings. The current development behind 298-300 Kentish Town Road goes some way to maintain this condition, at least from the public realm along Leverton Place. The ground floor offices approximate in height a high garden wall facing Leverton Place. The first floor residential accommodation is set back sufficiently far from Leverton Place to ensure that it is relatively concealed from the lane, thus not visually filling the 'void'. The new proposals would completely alter the mass/void pattern of the historic fabric along Leverton Place. This pattern is replicated across the Conservation Area, where large houses have garden areas or low out buildings etc behind them before housing along the roads running perpendicular starts. **Please refer to CPG - Design - section 5.12, particularly point 4:**

- **respecting and preserving the historic pattern where it exists, and the established townscape of the surrounding area, including the ratio of built to unbuilt space;**

Secondly, the submitted statement says that the new extension will be subservient to the building on Kentish Town Road. However it does not mention that it will be significantly taller than the properties it will be facing along Leverton Place, which is the main context within which it will be seen. **Hence point one of CPG - Design - 5.12 is not respectfully observed:**

- **having regard to the scale, form and massing of neighbouring buildings;**

Thirdly, the new proposals have no respect for the requirements of **CPG - Design - section 5.12, point 5:**

- **the effects of the proposal on the amenity of adjacent residential properties with regard to daylight, sunlight, outlook, light pollution/spillage, privacy or the working conditions of occupants of adjacent non-residential buildings;**

The proposed location of the new residential property's habitable room windows, 8.6m opposite the existing residential habitable room windows along Leverton Place (information from re-submitted plans), would constitute a gross intrusion of privacy, and be in utterly flagrant breach of generally accepted planning setback norms in England and Wales. No precedent is cited in the submission of developments where this degree of proximity has been accepted by the council or recently built within the immediate conservation area.

Setting

The submitted Heritage Statement claims :

'there is no intention to demolish this flank elevation (facing nos. 1 and 3 Leverton Street) as it replicates the profile of the proposed addition.'

This is at least in part a false statement. The submitted 'As Existing' and 'As Proposed' drawings clearly show that at the very least some demolition will be required. No proposed demolition drawings have been submitted with the application to assist the council and neighbours to understand what demolition will be required in the conservation area and in the immediate context of listed buildings, including demolitions along Leverton Place to create the new illustrated openings. **Please refer to CPG - Design - 4.57:**

For boundary treatments around listed buildings or in a conservation area we will expect that:

- **the elements are repaired or replaced to replicate the original design and detailing and comprise the same materials as the original features;**
- **the works preserve and enhance the existing qualities and context of the site and surrounding area**

The submission as it stands does not contain any detail information to enable the council to hold the developer to a standard of construction. **Again please refer to CPG - Design - section 2.33**, particularly the requirement to provide key construction details as part of a planning application to ensure the quality of design is maintained; and detailed design sections and supporting information to illustrate a proposal. No floor levels or parapet heights are provided on any of the submitted drawings.

Facade Rhythm

The submitted Heritage statement says:

'The Leverton Place elevation responds to the forms and motifs to be found in the surrounding conservation area.'

Broadly this statement is nonsense. Nowhere in the immediate conservation area do facades zig-zag or have vertically stepped terraces. No precedent is cited to justify this claim. Again, this is in essence a false statement.

I trust these objections will be noted.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Porter