

Thomas Brezina
Flat 10
4-10 Tower Street
WC2H 9NP London

Ms. S. Ballantyne-Way
Regeneration and Planning Development Management
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London WC1H 8ND

Dear Ms. Ballantyne-Way,

**Planning Application 2014/3425/P and 2014/3431/L – 22 Tower Street,
WC2H 9NS**

I have received your notification of the consultation regarding the above planning application. I do have some concerns and would appreciate your comments on these.

First, the D&A statement refers to 4-10 Tower Street as being offices. This is not so. There are 11 apartments in these buildings. I have lived here for some time without ever having to worry about being overlooked. When 22 Tower Street was offices it was, broadly, occupied during the working day whilst the residents of the apartments were out or, if at home, had no concerns about being overlooked. This will certainly not be the case if this application succeeds. On this point, how far away from our windows will the windows to No.22 be, if this application succeeds.

Secondly, apart from the question of being overlooked there is the question of added noise. Most of the apartments in our building have their sitting rooms at the front and in my case there also is the bedroom.

I am not a property professional but it concerns me very much that I will certainly be overlooked in a way that has never been the case before and subjected to added noise. Even though I live in the heart of Covent Garden as things stand, inside my apartment it is peaceful and quiet.

A further matter of serious concern is the proposal to create an outdoor space at third floor level for **all** residents of the "market use" apartments. I consider this to be a matter of great concern. It cannot be acceptable that the residents of 4-10 Tower Street should be subjected to the noise and violation of privacy that such a proposal would undoubtedly mean. The D&A statement suggests that this

terrace would hardly be visible from the street. It would most certainly be visible from our apartments and would, I feel, seriously reduce our ability to live peacefully and with relative privacy with what could easily amount to a communal party space directly opposite.

The paperwork supporting this application suggest that the apartments in it would be sold on the basis of not being able to have cars or motor bikes. How exactly would this be enforced? It would be one thing to say it in marketing or legal documents but quite another to ensure the provision would be enforced. Parking is already next door to impossible without a further 22 apartments adding to the congestion.

Looking at the site indication plans, it seems to me that the density of apartments is much too much for this area. Tower Street is narrow, as are many of the adjoining side streets. Even 20 bicycles (allowing for two vehicles to be parked on-site) would add significantly to local traffic.

Other than the four social housing units it seems to me that these apartments would be owned/occupied either by those wealthy enough to use them as a pied-a-terre during the working week or by very young professionals on whose consideration and discretion at coming and going quietly, I would not want to rely. In neither case do I see that this would add to any sense of community in the area. Already, too many of the office spaces in the locality have been lost, almost always to residential developments. I had thought the council had a policy to protect smaller office units in this area. At the moment, property prices in London have already begun to steady and even fall. The certainty of interest rate increases in the future could well mean another rash of reposessions of residential units which were not needed in the first place and would have a seriously adverse effect on the character and nature of the area.

To what extent can your authority reassure me and the others who live in our building that the impact of a development of the kind being considered would not be wholly detrimental to how we live in our properties. In addition to the above concerns, the D&A statement talks about outside lighting and matters of this sort which might well affect me adversely and which would not be an issue if this building kept its current use under planning law.

Yours sincerely,



Thomas Brezina

