Please can you explain why this has not been posted to your website, 12 days after submission. I know this is not the only consultation response that has not been posted, and feel it is extremely important that all interested parties are party to the facts.

I am also waiting on a response to the procedural points I raised in our objection.

I know you will agree that this is now a matter of urgency. As such, I await a response by close of business November 6th.

The below is a more detailed version of our objection to the planning application reference 2013/5970/P, for the site address 6 Coptic Street London WC1A 1NH, originally submitted via the website.

We object to this application on the following grounds:

- 1. Loss of light in all directions, and especially to the north of the proposed rear extension
- 2. In particular, loss of light to a native species hedgerow, adjacent and directly to the north of a proposed new wall at 2nd floor level
- 3. Disruption of the roof parapet line on the Coptic Street elevation. The Bloomsbury Conservation Area management plan notes that the site, including the parapet line, console brackets and fascias is part of a terrace contributing positively to the area, and that the view north along Coptic Street is a notable view to a landmark.

Scant detail is provided of the materials to be used, or the overall effect on the conservation area. As such, it must be assumed this proposal will lead to a negative impact on the conservation area, that is avoidable through a more thoughtful scheme.

4. Change of use from commercial to residential, where there is clear demand for commercial premises in the area. Camden Council has an exception in the central zone from the new permitted development rights to convert offices to homes, which appears to have been ignored.

Please note that we are tenants, and as such seek only to secure our right for quiet enjoyment of our residence. We have no concern for property value. This appears to be a ruthlessly commercial scheme, with no due consideration given to the needs of a globally significant conservation area. The applicant has ignored key parts of the Camden Council process, has not made direct contact

with neighbours, and has already commenced preparatory works, contravening best practice guidelines of schemes such as Considerate Constructors.

We wish to put on record that council notification procedures for this application were either not followed, or were inadequate to promptly alert affected parties:

- a. Properties noted on the application as neighbours did not receive letters about the application
   b. No notice was placed on Stedham Place, a street directly to the rear of the site, and the sole
- access route for several direct neighbours. The only notice was placed on Coptic Street. Those gaining access via Stedham Place have no reason to routinely travel along Coptic Street.
- c. The planning officer informs us a notice was placed in the Ham&High newspaper, rather than an appropriate publication for the south of the borough, such as West End Extra.

Furthermore, a quick analysis of Camden's Local Area Requirements for Planning Applications suggests that this application omits numerous pieces of necessary information, and as such is invalid. Aside from drawings, photographs and the standard brief application form, just three pages of well spaced large font text have been submitted, for this significant development. This is clearly an inadequate level of information,

A non-exhaustive list omissions is below, compiled by us based only on a laymen's knowledge, and listed by requirements section for convenience. We expect that a trained planner will spot further omissions:

### Section 1a

- 1. Application is in a conservation area, yet plans are not drawn to 1:50
- 2. Plans do not clearly show relationship to neighbouring buildings, particularly in respect of lost light on the rear elevation, and interruption to the parapet line at the front elevation
- 3. Roof plans are omitted, despite a proposal to substantially alter the roof
- 4. Relative levels of adjoining properties are not clearly indicated on elevations

#### Section 2:

4. Contains a clear admission that the lifetime homes standards are not met

### Section 3:

Conservation area concerns are afforded just one sentence in the Design and Access Statement

- 5. There is no discussion of the historic and architectural interest, despite the property being explicitly referenced in the Bloomsbury Conservation Area management plan
- 6. Principles are not discussed
- 7. Impact is not discussed
- 8. No mention of sources, expertise, or steps taken to minimise impact

# Photographs are inadequate:

- 9. not numbered
- 10. not cross-referenced to drawings
- 11, does not clearly show the roof line clearly
- 12. does not clearly show impact on the notable view to the north
- 13. pre-date substantial work on numbers 7 and 8 Copitic Street

## Section 4:

14. No statement on meeting the terms of DP27, in relation to the basement (eg

geological/hydrological study), as prepared by a chartered engineer or geologist

- 15. No daylight and sunlight assessment, despite a proposal to extend upwards to the south of numerous residences
- 16. No planning statement covering the change of use, including details of it's marketing at realistic prices for at least tow years, and that alternative uses/layouts have been considered
- 17. No sustainable statement (required for multi-occupancy buildings with more than 10 rooms)
- 18. No telecommunications details, in line with the Operators Code of Best Practice
- 19. No transport assessment, required for change of use
  20. No tree survey, despite native species trees and hedges planted adjacent and to the north to the
- site, and clearly affected by the proposal

  21. No construction management plan an important document in such a constrained site
- 22. No waste storage and collection details, required for change of use

As such, we feel there has been insufficient time and information to properly respond to this application, and we respond now only because the planning officer was unwilling to extend the consultation period, or request the required information.

We ask that Camden Council conduct a fresh analysis of the application, requests from the applicant all information required for a valid application, and begin a new consultation period once all information is available.

As part of this process, we invite council officers to inspect the site from our residence, since this provides a clear view of the site, and especially the negative impact of the proposed rear extension.

Finally, please notify us of any committee dates, further information, or deadlines.