

[REDACTED]

From: Rico Borza [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 May 2025 14:17
To: Planning
Subject: Formal Objection to Planning Application 2025/1683/P - 19 Charterhouse Street

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dear Planning Team,

I am writing to register my strong objection to the proposed development at 19 Charterhouse Street (Application Reference: 2025/1683/P). Having reviewed the application documents, I believe this development is fundamentally flawed and should be refused.

Primary Grounds for Objection

1. Statutory Duty Breach - Heritage Assets

Under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the Council has a statutory duty to pay special attention to preserving the character and appearance of conservation areas. This proposal demonstrably fails this test:

- The acknowledged breach of St Paul's Cathedral's protected viewing corridor constitutes direct harm to a Grade I listed building
- The 43% height increase fundamentally alters the conservation area's established roofscape and historic grain
- No public benefits have been demonstrated that could outweigh this heritage harm

2. Policy Non-Compliance

The application appears to breach multiple development plan policies:

- Camden's design guidance on appropriate heights within conservation areas
- London Plan policies on respecting historic context
- Strategic viewing corridor protection requirements

3. Design Quality Concerns

The Design Review Panel's criticism of the "too sheer" wall design along Saffron Hill appears unresolved. The narrow site constraints make meaningful height reduction impossible without removing entire floors, suggesting the proposal is inherently flawed.

Technical Objections

Visual Impact Assessment Inadequacies

Whilst the LVIA acknowledges viewing corridor harm, it fails to adequately assess:

- Cumulative visual impact with other area developments
- Effects on the broader conservation area streetscape
- Long-distance views from other heritage assets

Misleading Application Description

The failure to mention the substantial 5-storey increase in the development description suggests deliberate obfuscation of the proposal's true scale. This lacks the transparency expected in planning applications.

Neighbour Impact Assessment

Construction Phase

- Extended construction period (minimum 2 years) causing unreasonable disruption
- No adequate mitigation strategy for residents in surrounding buildings
- Potential for noise, dust, and traffic impacts inadequately assessed

Post-Development Effects

- Overshadowing and loss of daylight/sunlight to neighbouring properties
- Wind tunnel effects from the increased building mass
- Privacy impacts from elevated terraces and balconies

Procedural Concerns

The application's progression to committee despite clear policy breaches raises questions about proper assessment procedures. The confirmed viewing corridor breach should trigger automatic refusal under established heritage protection policies.

Alternative Approach Required

Rather than this inappropriate extension, a scheme respecting the existing building height and conservation area context would be more appropriate. The site's constraints suggest a more modest intervention would be both viable and policy-compliant.

Request for Refusal

I respectfully request that the Development Control Committee refuse this application on the grounds outlined above. The heritage harm is demonstrable and unjustified, whilst the scale represents clear overdevelopment inappropriate for this sensitive historic location.

Should the committee be minded to approve despite these objections, I request detailed justification for how the heritage harm has been outweighed and confirmation that all relevant policies have been properly considered.

Please confirm receipt of this objection and keep me informed of the decision and any subsequent developments.

Kind regards,

Rico Borza
117 Vesage Court
8a Leather Lane
EC1N 7RF