

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/3123/P	Janet Al-Utaibi	22/08/2024 14:44:22		<p>I am currently living at 25 Fitzroy Square, W1T 6ER. The back of Glebe House is visible from my rear window, towering over the narrow open space behind our building. Two windows already have a direct view into my open plan kitchen/living area -> anything erected above those windows will completely block out my sunlight (as well as that of the flat below) and allow even more intrusion into my living quarters. On these grounds alone I believe the application should be rejected.</p> <p>Apart from the irreversible effects of building the extension, I will also have to suffer temporary inconveniences such as noise, dirt and debris while the construction takes place, presumably over several months at least.</p> <p>It is hard to imagine that the construction of this roof extension will do much to alleviate the current housing crisis - clearly the only beneficiaries of this development will be the owners, while those living in the rest of Glebe House will gain nothing, and may well suffer from the disruption.</p> <p>I am also concerned that, given the current appearance of Glebe House, the extension will do nothing to add to the character of the Fitzroy Square Conservation Area and will probably detract from it, as the extension will be visible from Fitzroy Square itself.</p> <p>I am aware that a similar application was made and refused in November 2021. I also understand that objections have been raised to the current application but those who objected received no response to their concerns. This is clearly undemocratic.</p>
2024/3123/P	Lucina Wright	22/08/2024 12:29:14	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to the addition of a single storey roof extension to provide 2 new residential units to Glebe House. This would not only damage the integrity of the building but the surrounding area. From a structural perspective Glebe House was constructed to include the weight bearing of the existing building, a further two storeys would put undue pressure on a building that was built over 60 years ago with the foundations that don't have the benefit of current structural engineering knowledge. The possibility of subsidence/movement because of the increased load is great. From an architectural perspective the building is an entity in its own right, a great example of 60's design, retaining it's original features and it's in a conservation area. Lastly the light impact on the mews will be great, an extra storey will affect the surrounding buildings, everyone has a right to light, and the height will be incongruous with the surroundings. Given these three points I question how Camden Council can approve this development. Each point is a valid objection in it's own right. From a personal standpoint there is no moral ground for adding two penthouses to Glebe House, these aren't being built for social housing to alleviate any lack of housing pressure in the area. Us flat owners are going to be subjected to nine months to a year construction, the end result will ruin our beautiful building structurally and architecturally, will block out the light in the mews in a conservation area - for the benefit of the freeholder financially. It just isn't right.</p>

Application No: 2024/3123/P
Consultees Name: Jean Louis Jourade
Received: 22/08/2024 19:20:25
Comment: OBJ

Printed on: 23/08/2024 09:10:07

Response:
1
Glebe House Application No. 2024/3123/P

INAPPROPRIATE SCALE

1. Glebe House is already considered by Camden to be out of scale, as stated in the submitted Design and Access Statement (page 3). The proposal as drawn would increase the Glebe House building height to a minimum of 4.5m (a storey and a half) higher than Cleveland Court. It will be even higher and more out of scale when the proposal is properly drawn.
2. The architects drawings show the Glebe House proposal in relation to a Cleveland Court that includes an unbuilt roof extension. This is deceiving, for there is no indication that the Cleveland Court extension will be built. It is understood that a formal objection is being prepared to Camden's approval of the Cleveland Court proposals due to the inappropriate planning approval process, and that Camden's decision to grant approval may be overturned.

UNREALISTIC HEIGHT AND MASS

3. The submission does not show the full requirements and their impact. The height, appearance, relationship to neighbouring buildings, fire strategy and loss of light to neighbouring properties are each incorrect.
- The architects plans show the proposed extension to be smaller in plan than the flats below. There is no indication in the architects drawings of how this is supported.
- There is no indication of a horizontal space in which the drainage from the proposed bathrooms and kitchens will connect to the risers above the existing roof.
- The previous application 2021/1782/P includes a structural report (29481 Glebe House PM Planning Reportv2) that recognises the inability of the existing mansard roof to support another floor and states the requirement for a separate and additional structure above the existing roof. When the required structure and drainage zones are included in the architects plans the proposal will be considerably higher.
- The appearance and impact will also change detrimentally from those shown on the architects images due to the projecting external structures required and the vertical extension to the stair and lift core. In the architects images there is no structure shown supporting the proposed terrace to the Fitzroy Mews elevation.
4. The Design and Access Statement (page 7) states that the height of the pre-application proposal was reduced at the request of Camden Planning Department. This is stated as having been done, but, by reference to the structural report (29481 Glebe House PM Planning Reportv2), it is impossible to achieve. When the structure and drainage zones are added, the height of the building will increase, even beyond that shown in the pre-application proposal. It is recognised that structural matters are not a Planning consideration, but Planning Permission should not be granted for a proposal that does not reflect reality.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

Printed on: 23/08/2024 09:10:07

UNDERSTATED DETRIMENTAL IMPACT ON ADJACENT PROPERTY

5. The Sunlight and Daylight Report and the Fire Statement both rely on the architect's proposal drawings, and both will need correcting to show the full extent of the impact on adjacent properties when the proposal is properly drawn.

6. The Sunlight and Daylight Report does not evaluate all neighbouring properties affected by the proposals.

7. It is possible that the proposed new floor will exceed 18m above ground level. The Fire Planning Statement notes that this will call for a second staircase. The addition of this staircase will severely impact the flats below.

8. The Fire Planning Statement clause 5.2 states that the proposal requires sprinklers to be installed in the existing flats if this proposal is constructed. Acceptance of these disruptive works from each leaseholder should be a prerequisite of any consideration of this application.

9. The proposed terrace (Mews side) covers my terrace underneath and will block the light to the existing Penthouse windows.

10. The proposed Juliette balconies (Cleveland Street side) are directly overlooking the penthouse terrace, severely impacting privacy.

11. The proposal blocks the 2 existing mansard roof lights, further reducing the daylight in my flat below.

12. Planning permission was granted in 1969 for this building with my flat referred to as a penthouse. This penthouse status should therefore be guaranteed.

13. The proposals give no consideration to the impact during construction nor reflect on the extremely narrow access to Fitzroy Mews.

a. The construction process will inevitably compromise my ability to live in the flat for many months because of construction noise and dust.

b. My terraces will also be affected by the proposed re-cladding.

c. The lift will be out of use for weeks possibly months and although the proposal to extend the lift to my floor is a welcome development, the entrance to the lift in my floor will be a mere meter away from my front door with all the potential noise nuisance this could create.

For all these reasons, I strongly object and hope the planning application will be turned down.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/3123/P	Tony Meadows	22/08/2024 10:55:08	OBJ	<p>1. I object to this application on the basis that the submission continues to severely impact the sunlight and daylight to my home at 1B Fitzroy Mews, and my office at 2-3 Fitzroy Mews.</p> <p>2. I object on the basis that the increase in height of an already uncharacteristically large and overbearing building will add to the detriment in the quality and character of Fitzroy Mews, part of the Fitzroy Square Conservation Area.</p> <p>3. I object on the basis that the proposal as submitted and its supporting information does not show the true requirements and their impact, and that the height, appearance, relationship to neighbouring buildings, fire strategy and loss of light to neighbouring homes, including my own, are each stated incorrectly.</p> <p>UNREALISTIC HEIGHT AND MASS</p> <p>The architects plans show the proposed extension to be smaller in plan than the existing floor below, and there is no indication in the drawings of how this is supported. There is also no indication of a horizontal zone above the existing roof in which the drainage from the new bathrooms and kitchens will connect to the risers.</p> <p>The previous application 2021/1782/P includes a structural report (29481 Glebe House PM Planning Reportv2) that recognises the inability of the existing mansard roof to support another floor and states the requirement for a separate and additional structure above the existing roof. When the required structure, cladding, insulation, roofing, flooring and drainage zones are included in the architects plans the proposal will be considerably higher.</p> <p>The appearance and impact will also change detrimentally from those shown on the architects images due to the projecting external structures required and the vertical extension to the stair and lift core.</p> <p>The elevation drawings show the Glebe Court proposal in relation to a Cleveland Court with a roof extension that has not been built. This is deceiving, for there is no indication that the Cleveland Court extension will be built, and I understand that a formal legal objection to that permission is being prepared. Glebe Court is already considered to be out of scale as stated in the Design and Access Statement (page 3), and the proposal as drawn now increases the height to a minimum of 4.5m (a storey and a half) higher than Cleveland Court. It will be even higher when the proposal is drawn at the realistic height.</p> <p>The Design and Access Statement (page 7) states that the height of the pre-application proposal was reduced at the request of Camden Planning Department. This is stated by the architects as having been done but, by reference to the structural report (29481 Glebe House PM Planning Reportv2), it is impossible to achieve. When the required structure, cladding, insulation, fire protection and drainage zones are added, the height of the building will significantly increase, even beyond that shown in the pre-application proposal. It is recognised that structural matters are not a Planning consideration, but Planning Permission should not be granted for a proposal that does not reflect reality, or the legal consequences of the Grenfell tragedy.</p> <p>INCORRECT ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT ON ADJACENT PROPERTY</p> <p>The Daylight and Sunlight Report and the Fire Statement submitted as part of this application, both rely on the architects proposal drawings, and both will need correcting to show the full extent of the impact when the proposal is properly drawn.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

The Daylight and Sunlight Report fails to address my properties which will be substantially disadvantaged by the proposals. My house lies directly north of Glebe House, but has not been assessed and will be significantly compromised by the increased height. The 45deg skylight angle from my ground floor windows was a defining limitation for the current height, and that height is now proposed to be greatly exceeded.

The Fire Statement notes that, following the lessons of Grenfell, a floor level of 18m above ground will require a second staircase, which would be impossible to install without severely impacting the existing homes below. It is quite likely that the proposed new floor will equal or exceed 18m above ground level when the structural engineering, cladding, fire protection, temperature insulation, flooring, roofing and drainage requirements are properly added.

The Fire Planning Statement clause 5.2 states that, in the wake of Grenfell, the proposal requires sprinklers to be installed in the existing flats if this proposal is constructed. Acceptance of these disruptive works from each leaseholder should be a minimum prerequisite of any consideration of this application, and I understand these works have not been agreed.

The proposal gives no consideration of the impact during construction or reflect on the extremely narrow access to Fitzroy Mews. The construction process will inevitably seriously compromise resident and emergency access to, from and within the Mews, a fact that alone should prevent any consideration of this proposal.

It is self-evident from the information available to the Planning Officers that this application should not be considered, and it certainly should not be approved.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/3123/P	Giada Vercelli	22/08/2024 11:43:34	OBJ	<p>I am writing to formally object to the planning application for the proposed development at Glebe House on Fitzroy Mews. As a resident and homeowner at 5 Fitzroy Mews, I have serious concerns about the negative impact this project will have on the local community and my quality of life.</p> <p>1. Prolonged and Extensive Construction Works: The construction process is likely to be lengthy and disruptive, causing significant inconvenience to residents. The prolonged presence of construction crews, machinery, and materials will create a daily disturbance that will affect the peace and quiet of the neighborhood.</p> <p>2. Dust Pollution: Construction activities inevitably generate a large amount of dust, which will affect air quality and pose health risks, particularly for those with respiratory conditions. This dust pollution will also settle on homes, vehicles, and outdoor spaces, leading to further inconvenience and potential damage.</p> <p>3. Noise Nuisance: The noise from construction works, including the use of heavy machinery and building activities, will be a constant disturbance. This will particularly affect those who work from home, have young children, or are elderly.</p> <p>4. Restricted Access to My Home: The construction activities will likely restrict access to my property, making it difficult to enter and leave my home freely. This is particularly concerning in cases of emergency or when immediate access is required.</p> <p>5. Limited Car Access to My Regularly Used Garage: The construction will also likely limit access to my garage, which I use regularly. This restriction will cause significant inconvenience, especially if it prevents me from using my vehicle when needed.</p> <p>6. Further Reduction of Natural Light: Glebe House already obstructs a significant amount of natural light to my home and the surrounding area. Adding an additional floor will exacerbate this issue, further reducing the light and creating a darker, more oppressive environment.</p> <p>7. Increased Sense of Claustrophobia: The proposed additional floor will contribute to a heightened sense of claustrophobia within the mews, making the area feel even more enclosed and congested. This is detrimental to the living conditions of all residents.</p> <p>8. No Community Benefit: The proposed development offers no tangible benefits to the community. The only clear advantage is the real estate capital gain for the owner, while the local residents will bear the brunt of the negative impacts.</p> <p>In conclusion, this proposal stands to significantly disrupt the lives of the residents in Fitzroy Mews, with no apparent benefits to the community. I urge Camden Council to carefully consider the concerns raised and reject this planning application.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/3123/P	Valery Deruelle	22/08/2024 11:34:05	OBJ	<p>I would like to OBJECT this application and express my serious concerns over this project to raise one additional floor on the top of the existing Glebe house on Fitzroy Mews.</p> <p>The main concern we have is the loss of light and the sense of claustrophobia in the mews. I am the owner and resident at 5 Fitzroy Mews facing Glebe house. Not only Glebe house is already an imposing building surpassing the height of all existing dwellings in the mews but more importantly it already significantly blocks a lot of natural light into the mews.</p> <p>Beside the light report, I am surprised of lack of consideration in the application to the residents that will directly be impacted by this application living in Fitzroy Mews:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extensive and prolonged construction works - Dust pollution - Noise nuisance - restricted access to my home - restricted car access to my garage in constant use - loss of natural light - sense of increased claustrophobia - absence and zero benefit to the community beside real estate capital gain by owner. <p>How is this application different from the one already submitted and rejected few years ago?</p>