

Deordra.

Planning Application Number: _____

2009/2966/P.

Planning Application Address: _____

1-8 WHITFIELD PLACE AND 114-116

I support the application (please state reasons below)

☐

I object to the application (please state reasons below)

☒

I have no comments on the application

☐

Your comments

WE ARE A BUSINESS BASED IN THE WHITFIELD
STREET. PLEASE CONSIDER THE LEVEL OF
NOISE AS IT MIGHT DISRUPT OUR WORK
AND THEREFORE LOSE BUSINESS.

AS A TRAVEL COMPANY, MOST OF OURS
WORK ON THE PHONE AND "NOISE" IN OFFICE
WOULD ~~BE~~ HAVE A STRONG IMPACT ON OUR
BUSINESS.

Your comments continued

Planning Application Number: 2010/5185/P

Planning Application Address: Suffolk House Whitfield Place W1

I support the application (please state reasons below)

☐

I object to the application (please state reasons below)

☒

I have no comments on the application

☐

Your comments

Whilst there is no objection to the proposal to change the market housing to affordable and treating this as a credit against future obligations, there is strong objection to both the dwelling and tenure mix. This is a typical example of double counting by the applicants. The 4 social rented units provided in the approved scheme (2 x 5 bed units + 2 x 2 bed units) are in discharge of a S106 and constituted a swap between the previous location in Aite House for that in the Suffolk House scheme. Those 4 units should therefore be disregarded in assessing the current proposal therefore, involving the change of only 9 units from market to affordable housing. On the basis of the 60:40 split between social rented and intermediate 5-6 units should be social rented and 3-4 intermediate giving a total overall split of 9-10 social rented and 3-4 intermediate - very different from the split being currently proposed. Similarly in respect of dwelling mix the 9 units which are the subject of the change comprise 1 x 1bed and 8 x 2bed units. Policy requires 50% of social rented to be large homes i.e 3 bedrooms or more. In relation to the 9 units the present scheme provides none. We would like to be notified of the relevant attributes please.

Your comments continued

Application No:

2010/5185/P

Site Address:

Suffolk House, 1-8
Whitfield Place &
114-116 Whitfield Street
London
W1T

Case Officer:

Conor McDonagh

**Received:**

26/10/2010 11:23:24

Printed on: 27/10/2010 09:05:09

Response:

Suffolk House

Comment:

OBJ

While the creation of affordable housing is to be welcomed the lower two floors of this building are not suitable for residential use due to the noise and proximity of the football pitch.

The proximity of this building to the rear of the properties on Grafton Way and the general lack of sunlight or privacy reinforces the unsuitability of the conversion of the ground and first floors to residential.

The need to provide affordable housing should not overrule normal development standards to provide a reasonable degree of amenity for the occupier. This is particularly true for affordable housing where choice of accommodation is usually not an option.

I have lived here for twenty five years. The character of the area is the mix of uses and the mix of cultures. The loss of commercial space in Suffolk House will detract from this character. This stretch of Whitfield Street is predominately residential but with a significant amount of commercial use at street level which creates the diversity and the character.

The earlier decision to delete the residential component from Asta

Application No:

Site Address:

Case Officer:

Consultees Name:

Consultees Address:

Received:


Printed on: 27/10/2010 09:05:09

Response:

Comment:

House is a shame. There is no residential accommodation on Whitfield Street between Graffon Way and Tottenham Street. Recent new office developments and office refurbishments on Whitfield Street have not contributed to the mixed use character of Fitzrovia.


Please refuse this application and ask the developers to provide a mixed use development that retains commercial uses on the ground and first floors.




Subject: APPLICATION 2015/5185/P - Conor McDonagh

Dear Mr McDonagh

Suffolk House, 1-8 Whitfield Place W1

Further to our telephone discussion I am commenting on this revised application on behalf 




Objection was made to the previous scheme on the grounds of the visual impact and overwhelming effect of the bulk of the new fourth floor and the access balconies on the row of listed properties in Grafton Way and, additionally, on the daylight to their rear rooms, especially at ground floor level. Recognising that No 62 is in commercial use, my Clients believe consideration should still be given to the well-being of occupants of adjacent properties and the adverse result of the development mitigated as far as possible.

A request was made for light coloured material to be used for the cladding of the new top floor and also the balcony balustrades instead of the dark brown colour the Architects' proposed. This would achieve some lightening of what will be a heavily depressing outlook and my Clients will be grateful if this could be required by a condition in any approval of this latest scheme. Even better would be a change of cladding material to plain aluminium or zinc-coated steel to act as a positive sky reflector.

It is incumbent on us all, the Council included, to make sure developments are as energy efficient as possible and should not create additional loading and costs in respect of adjacent buildings. Light or reflective cladding will help to minimise the increase in artificial lighting loads that will inevitably follow the construction of the additional floor.

In due course I look forward to confirmation that any permission contains a condition requiring approval of a light coloured cladding material to the south east elevation.

In passing I would reiterate that the Council's planning website gives two closing dates for receipt of comments as the 5th and 9th of this month. Confusing!



[Redacted]
Development Control Team
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall Extension
Argyle Street
London
WC1H 8EQ

RECEIVED 02 NOV 2010

28th October 2010

Application ref: 2010/5185/P
Associated Ref: 2009/2966/P

Dear Team and Committee Members,

I am writing to object to the above application received for Suffolk House, 1-8 Whitfield Place & 114-116 Whitfield Street, London W1T.

[Redacted]

As a local resident representative, I am aware that the local community is strongly opposed to the granting of the above application.

It is regrettable that Derwent Plc has decided to withdraw their initial mix use application for the site, which retained the current commercial spaces on street level.

The main concerns are that this new development would add more pressure on services such as refuse collection and street parking. I am not aware of any plans by the developer to include secure parking garages, refuse disposal and storage areas in their design. It would be preferable if the ground floor level were reserved for this purpose.

The previous application made more sense, as the development site faces a widely used football pitch, making the lower levels unsuitable as residential flats.

Another concern is that the development of additional residential units in this small area of Whitfield St would lead to overcrowding, damage the current mixed used character of the area and turn this section of the community into a residential ghetto.


Darwent's decision not to provide affordable flats at Asta House, 65 Whitfield St as originally agreed, shows a lack of understanding.

Residents would prefer to see a better spread of residential units along Whitfield St and believe that such developments would enhance the character of the local area.

I feel strongly that the above application would not benefit local residents or community; therefore, I am putting my objection forward and asking Council to refuse this new application.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]



Conor McDonagh
Planning Services
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Argyle Street
WC1H 8ND



4th November 2010

Dear Sirs,

Re Suffolk House App Ref 2010/5185P


I am writing to object to the planning application, many of these matters were raised in the previous application relating to this property.

It is hard to fathom why Derwent Plc is not happy with the previous consent granted (in spite of objections) and has now chosen to apply for a complete change of use to residential. Neither the building or the immediate area will take what they are now proposing. At least their last application kept the ground floor area for commercial use – now they would like to make this residential as well. This street side and street level floor is totally inappropriate for use as residential. The building is adjacent to the Warren football pitch.

The application is for a development comprising a total of 51 bedrooms – this could lead to a total of around 100 new residents – this is just too many for this small stretch of road which already contains a great deal of assisted housing and very little privately owned property.

The developer maintains that the development will be 'car free' and has not made provision for any car parking space, at present parking is already a problem during office hours as several cars with fraudulently obtained residential parking permits arrive at 8.30 in the morning and leave at around 6.30 in the evening. This situation will not be improved by the development.

Even assuming that half the residents would wish to own a bike - spaces to park 51 pushbikes at least must be contained within the plans. It is easy to see That up to 100 new residents in this small stretch of street could lead to overcrowding. The spread of residential properties should be throughout the length of Whitfield St (and in particular at Asta House also owned by Derwent) - and not just dumped in north Whitfield St just because it is convenient for Derwent Plc. Quite why they are not prepared to build residential units in some of their other properties in Whitfield St is difficult to see. With the Hotel backing on to the Warren, the continuous flow of students in the area, this development will lead to overcrowding. In effect this development may well lead to the 'ghetto-isation' of north Whitfield St.

Although it is claimed that these flats will be 'affordable' that is simply not the case - a cursory look at A2 Dominion's own website shows that these flats will only be affordable to those with large salaries - not those on low incomes.

There are already security issues regarding the Warren. Like any open urban space it is widely used by all kinds of people to stop and simply take time out. However, it is a magnet for drug dealers and their customers, vagrants and disaffected youth. There is already tension between youths using the square and the owners of the privately owned housing on the north side of the square - this is likely to escalate with new residents to pick on. I understand that Suffolk House has also been broken into several times over the last few years.

The current mixed use of this building works very well within the area of north Whitfield St - to allow this development to go ahead would lead to a situation where one end of Whitfield St is full of bright shiny commercial Derwent property and the other would simply be referred to as 'the wrong end of Whitfield St'

