

Gentet, Matthias

From: Gentet, Matthias
Sent: 09 August 2013 11:56
To: Gentet, Matthias
Subject: RE: Application reference 2013/0643/P revise- logged 05/08 Seyl

From: Thuairé, Charles
Sent: 02 August 2013 10:11
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Application reference 2013/0643/P revise- logged 05/08 Seyl
Importance: High

PI register attached as objection to revised scheme
 ta

Charles Thuairé
 Senior Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 5867

From: Gill Scott [mailto:]
Sent: 30 July 2013 13:34
To: Thuairé, Charles
Subject: Application reference 2013/0643/P revise
Importance: High

Charles

61-63 Rochester Place, NW1
 Application reference 2013/0643/P Revisions dated May/June

Yesterday I send our comments.

I am sorry my computer crashed as I was saving and changes and additional pages that I had included were scrambled; please destroy yesterdays email in favour of these documents.

Attached please find our comments re the revisions
 one letter and a set of 12 drawings as one pdf.

I feel angry that the drawings are still wrong; I have provided overlays made from the architects drawings to show the inaccuracy of the 25° on the second floor. Due to the poor quality of the drawings submitted, it has taken many hours of checking and comparison to provide Camden with evidence to support our claims. I hope that officers will give attention to our deliberations.

We wish officers to note that these revisions answer few issues detailed in the supporting letter, insufficiently answer some issues and fail to address some issues.

The building up of the party wall to take the light and views from 57-59 remains unacceptable. The balcony at the back has not been removed.

The reduction of the first floor is small and includes space which can not be used to work in [no head height] near to Reed's Place just for the sake of getting a foot print that can later be changed.

The feeling of bulk close to Reed's Place remains unacceptable.

There is no step down on Rochester Place; and the set back is compromised by a visible glass screen and also by inaccurate drawings of 57-59 which they say they will match.

The flat remains severely compromised by communal access with the business premises.

I will provide these drawings as paper copies at a later date.

Regards Gill

Gill Scott
for and on behalf of Reed's and Rochester Place Neighbourhood Association

48 Rochester Place
London NW1 9JX

