

From: colin serfs sargent <
Sent: 05 June 2023 16:03
To: Planning Planning
Subject: Objection to Planning Application 2022/5568/P.

[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 Camden Council Planning Department,

Please accept this letter as a severe objection to Planning Application 2022/5568/P.

The application is riddled with inconsistencies and falsehoods to provide support for a purely economics-driven scheme that completely disregards the health, safety and quality of life of the surrounding residents. For example, the supporting arguments imply that a person living in modest accommodation doesn't deserve sunlight, which is outrageous. These statements are the complete opposite of what Camden Council stands for. Why should a person with a small kitchen be perceived as not deserving of light?

How may the applicant deem it acceptable to photograph private residents' windows to assess what happens behind them? This kind of action is a severe breach of privacy to fuel a project that will do nothing for the local community but fatten someone's pockets who can afford a large kitchen and is therefore "allowed" to have daylight.

How can the argument that someone's window is not facing within 90 degrees south give the applicant the right to take the last bit of light they have away from them?

The proposed development builds on top of the little green spaces left in this immediate vicinity; again, there is no concern about the environment. How can the argument that an area has little nature justify encroachment over our last strips of green spaces? Further, a protected tree in the back garden of 39 College Crescent will be severely robbed of light. The health of that tree should have been considered in the application.

The comparison of the site with Charlotte Street is laughable. Charlotte Street is a cobbled road with a one-way traffic flow. The argument that this proposed building will turn Finchley Road into the next Charlotte Street is far-fetched and a testament to the applicant grasping for any justification to get approval for this project.

In the case of 39 College Crescent, there are three falsehoods in the application, which is surprising, considering the applicant hired people to photograph us to assess whether our rooms are habitable.

The application states that only twenty of our 28 rear-facing windows feed light into habitable rooms. This is incorrect.

Our rear facade is where all our habitable rooms are located and where most of our light derives from. Of the 28 windows mentioned above, 24 are servicing livable areas. Only one window in each house belongs to a bathroom.

The application states that our living rooms are dual aspect and receive light from the other side of the building. This is factually wrong, and the applicant knows that very well, having searched our plans.

Further, I am highly concerned that up to 56 hotel guests will have a clear view of our bedrooms, bathrooms, living spaces, kitchens and the little outdoor space available for our children to play in. We would be living like animals in the zoo where every night, another round of 56 guests, whose background and intentions are unknown to us, would watch with interest what we were doing in our private homes. The potential argument that we ought to get blinds and curtains isn't logical, considering how much light would be taken from us. We would have the option of living in the dark or being interesting specimens for tourists, constantly worrying about who our children are being watched by. For your information: 12 young children live at 39 College Crescent.

I am also concerned about how Camden Council was processing this application without bringing this to the attention of hundreds of local residents who would be severely affected by this proposed monstrosity.

The council can't rely on a flyer affixed to a lamppost next to the property in question, while no flyers were attached near the properties severely affected by its development plan. Even more, the infringement on our right to light, quiet enjoyment, safety and privacy would be so severe it calls for notifications per post, which is essential considering that some residents still have to isolate.

Regards,

Colin Sargent