

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

I am currently living at 25b Fitzroy Square, W1T 6ER. The back of Glebe House is visible from my rear window, towering over the narrow open space behind our building. As I said in my previous objection made in August last year, two windows in Glebe House already have a direct view into my open plan kitchen/living area, and anything erected above those windows will completely block out my sunlight (as well as that of the flat below) and allow even more intrusion and overlooking into my living quarters. I was also concerned that, apart from the irreversible effects of building the extension, I would also have to suffer temporary but not inconsiderable inconveniences such as noise, dirt and debris while the construction took place, presumably over several months at least.

When I heard that planning permission for the Glebe House extension had been refused, I was very pleased, but I see that the refusal was made on the grounds that the development would: i) be detrimental to the appearance of the host property, the streetscape and the Fitzroy Square Conservation Area; ii) be likely to contribute unacceptably to traffic disruption, air pollution and be detrimental to general highway and pedestrian safety; iii) be likely to promote the use of non-sustainable modes of transport and contribute to air pollution and congestion in the surrounding area; iv) fail to meet the needs of households unable to access market housing, and v) fail to promote sustainable transport choices. The refusal does not seem to have addressed the very valid concerns made in 44 objections from neighbours which included comments about the availability of daylight and sunlight to properties in Fitzroy Mews and Fitzroy Square, and the detrimental impact of the construction.

Camden Council's report notes that the pre-application documents submitted in 2023 included a Daylight/Sunlight Assessment which was found to "suitably demonstrate that the proposed roof extension would not significantly affect the availability of daylight/sunlight to neighbouring properties" – but the Assessment did not even consider the effect on access to light in properties on the western side of Fitzroy Square. See page 2, para 1.1.3: "The aim of the assessment is to consider the impact of the development on the light receivable by the neighbouring properties at 1 to 13 Cleveland Court, 4 to 10 Fitzroy Mews, 90B & 100 Cleveland Street, Carlton House and Clifton House." This completely omits the impact on the rear of the western side of Fitzroy Square, which includes the flat I occupy and others in this building and neighbouring buildings. As the effect of overlooking and deprivation of sunlight on the western terrace of Fitzroy Square was not included in the Council's refusal, the developers have not responded to it. Nevertheless, the Council concluded in any case that the proposed extension was "poorly designed" (para 7.5) and that it "would cause harm to the wider Fitzroy Square Conservation Area" (7.14), and I hope this conclusion will be upheld.

Camden Council's report also notes that the proposed units would each feature "a large private terrace, facing east". This would be even more intrusive than simply having overlooking windows as the occupants would be even more likely to spend time on the terraces, and would be able to see right into my living space, which would be unsettling, intrusive and a substantial loss of privacy.

The report fails to mention the very valid points made by objectors about disruption, noise and pollution affecting their wellbeing during the proposed construction, although the second and third objections reference potential harmful contributions to air pollution. The developers' response does not address this at all, apart from making reference to a Unilateral Undertaking which deals with the Construction Management Plan and Implementation Contribution, although I don't see this document being available for comment.

In conclusion, I find that the developers' response of February 2025 is an inadequate response which does not address the objections raised last year. I strongly object to the proposed development and I trust that Camden Council's original decision will be upheld.

COMMENT DOCUMENTS

The documents listed below were uploaded with this form:

Relates to Section: REPRESENTATION
Document Description: Your comments on the appeal.
File name: rear view 25b Fitzroy Square.jpeg

PLEASE ENSURE THAT A COPY OF THIS SHEET IS ENCLOSED WHEN POSTING THE ABOVE DOCUMENTS TO US