

Sent: 20 December 2013 10:51
To: Planning
Subject: logged 28 Tottenham Street LETTER TO CAMDEN COUNCIL PLANNING DEPT;
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged
Categories: Orange Category

**LETTER TO CAMDEN COUNCIL PLANNING DEPT;
PLANNING REQUEST 2013/7034/P**

**6 SUNCREST CLOSE
BARTON
TORQUAY
DEVON
TQ2 8HR**

21 December 2013

Dear Sir,

28 Tottenham Street, London

Planning request 2013/7034/P

(Erection of three storey rear extension with roof light, following demolition of existing single storey external WC and replacement of front light well grill with glass to retail unit and flats)

I am the freeholder of 30 Tottenham Street, the property adjacent and next door to 28 Tottenham Street, upon which an application has been submitted, to build a 3 storey extension at the rear of the building. I understand that a similar development is being contemplated to the property on the other side and adjacent to me also.

30 Tottenham Street is made up of 2 domestic flats, an art gallery and office, all of which would suffer from such a development with the depletion of natural light.

I know that Mr Andrew Conningsby, the proprietor of Debutart, an art gallery and one of my tenants, has already sent an email to you dated 17th December raising serious concerns over the development.

I fully support and endorse his comments in that the exclusion of natural light will have a detrimental effect on any business operating from my premises, but in particular on that of ALL my tenants.

I am the third generation of the same family owning the freehold of 30 Tottenham Street and consider any development of properties in this conservation area totally out of keeping and object in strongest terms to this application.

I should be grateful if you would please arrange to visit my property and the business operating from the ground floor of my property before any planning decision is made.

Would you please contact, in the first instance, my managing agent Charles Bravo Management, and /or the proprietor of Debutart, Mr Andrew Conningsby both of whom I have copied in on this letter. Would you also please copy in on all communication, Mr Cavan Wilce, my legal and financial adviser, whose email address also features below.

No doubt you will communicate with me in all matters relating to this planning issue, which I object to most strongly.

Yours sincerely

Miss J.M Mantello

Charles Bravo Management, Mrs Stephanie Pryke

steph@charlesbravo.com

Mr Andrew Conningsby, Proprietor Debutart


andrew@debutart.com

Mr Cavan Wilce

cavanwilce@btinternet.com

Charlotte Street Association

39 Tottenham Street
London W1T 4RX



Development Control,
Planning Services,
London Borough of Camden,
Camden Town Hall, Argyle Street,
London WC1H 8ND.

For the attention of Miheer Mehta, Planning Officer..

By email to: planning@camden.gov.uk

26th December 2013

Dear Miheer Mehta,

Re: refs. 2013/7034/P and 2013/7765/L: 28 Tottenham Street, London W1T 4RH:

Erection of 3-storey rear extension with rooflight; demolition of existing external wc;
replacement of front lightwell grill with glass; creation of flats; etc.

We have had much time-consuming difficulty in looking at the plans on the website, and particularly in printing them out so that we could discuss the proposals; the applicant's drawings appear not to be in the usual format for viewing, as well as easily printing out.

There is strong objection to the proposals:

- (a). There is strong objection in principle to the proposed three-storey rear extension (and for the whole width of the house) to this Listed Building. The width and height of the extension will substantially cover most of the existing historic rear elevation which appears to be the original Georgian/18th Century façade.
- (b). In their Heritage Statement, section 2.3, the applicant states that there is a precedent for the presence of a structure on the footprint of the rear yard, as possibly indicated on the OS map of 1894; and the 1974 photograph (showing a high brick wall). From the map and the photo, this could well be indicating an enclosed rear yard. Nonetheless, it is very unlikely (and there appears to be no evidence) that there would be an extension higher than one storey in this rear location. Also, none of the other Georgian/18th C houses in this terrace appear to show multi storey extensions, if any.
- (c). Mention is also made in their Heritage Statement that the front façade of the top three stories was "replaced using yellow stock brick" in 1974, after being Listed. Our understanding is that this part of the front façade had to be rebuilt for structural reasons, due to it badly bowing it. Typically, the front façade brick walls of Georgian terraced houses were often not "tied in" to the floor structure and party walls behind.

Continued to page 2

- (d). There is also strong objection to the proposed residential mix, which should be retained as a single family house. In the Application Form, the applicant has stated that the existing residential consists of residential studios at 1st, 2nd and 3rd Floor respectively. We do not agree that this is the current planning use. To our knowledge, these upper floors (above the existing Ground Floor Retail use) are one single-family house unit. Our understanding is that the long term tenant (of more than 40 years, and who left in June 2012), occupied these floors as a single family house with her family, bringing up her children here; and with a bathroom on one floor (rear room) and a kitchen on the other floor (rear room).
- (e). In rehabilitating the property, there is also strong objection to the removal of the diagonal chimney stacks/fireplaces of the rear rooms in the Basement, 1st, 2nd and 3rd Floors respectively, as part of the historic fabric and character of the interiors of this Listed Building.
- (f). For the proposed Basement flat, there appears to be little or no natural ventilation.
- (g). Although there is objection in principle to the proposed rear extension, there is also objection to the proposed materials, especially to powder coated aluminium window frames, and metal clad external doors, being an extension to a Listed Building and in the Conservation Area.
- We are also concerned that it is not clear what the proposals are for refurbishing and retaining the existing building elements:
- e.g. the timber panelled walls of the ground Floor entrance corridor to the residential; timber sliding-sash windows; internal doors and their unusual architraves; timber staircase and balustrade/handrail; etc.
- For any proposals to this Listed Building, proposals for all these elements need to be spelt out in detail; and should be retained and incorporated as part of the design for any proposals.

Yours sincerely,

Clive Henderson,
Committee Member,
On behalf of Charlotte Street Association.

Copy: CSA Committee.
Cllr Adam Harrison.