

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/3117/P	Gorodetska	33 Inverness street	16/10/2014 15:53:55	OBJ	Mister and Mrs Gorodetska 33 Inverness street NW1 7HB London

London 16/10/2014

Ref : 2014/3117/P  
Revised plans

FAO the Committee

Dear Sir or Madam,

First of all I would like to alert your attention on the fact that, so far, this application hasn't been followed with the professional care needed from the Development Control Planning Services and officer for such a big application.

Indeed, the person in charge of the pre application was no longer in activity for the application itself with absolutely no follow up between this pre app and the application itself.

Consequently, Mrs Carr showed a totally wrong map on the Camden portal website for this application totally misleading to all the people watching this application on Camden portal website . It does show how ignorant she was of the project and not paying attention at all to it though it s an overdevelopment and an application for more than 500 square meters. As such, on the contrary, it would need extra special attention from the Council.

Worse, Ms Carr deliberately ignored all the residents of Inverness street from the consultation panel and even us the 33 Inverness who are the adjoining property that would have party walls with the school were not involved in the initial consultation.

We find it totally not professional that no care is taken on this application. It all looks like the application is already granted before even starting. Why ? Is there any special relationship between Cavendish private school and the Council that the public should know ?

We had to complain to Mrs Carr personally to have at last the plans showed correctly on the planning portal website and to receive a letter of consultation though once again we are the direct neighbours.

This total lack of respect to the residents from Camden Council is not reasonable neither acceptable at all and absolutely and totally unfair.

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**

**Comment:**    **Response:**

Though we complained about that, still lots of residents of the street were not informed of the application by Mrs Carr that kept on asking their opinion to the businesses of Parkway that are not concerned by the project at all instead of consulting the residents of Inverness. It does show her clear and only interest of mind in favourishing just the businesses versus the residents . Why ? Could Mrs Carr elaborate this to the Committee?

Moreover , this application is still benefitting from the reorganisation of Development Control Planning Services since Mrs Arbery Bethany left the Council too : no follow up neither on this part. It does lead to the situation were there is no follow up at all on this case. So with such obvious lack of organisation from Camden the school is now allowing the school to present plans that are even worse than before.

Let me comment that this application has received more than 30 objections from the residents and from CAAC.

This application is a total fraud of more than 10 breaches in Camden Planning policies clearly stated in my husband and mine objections.

Despite of all those elements, Mrs Carr is refusing to take any consideration of thoses objections. This is just an outrageous scandal of favourisism towards a lucrative business (private school) from the Council.

It 's extremelly obvious that Mrs Carr should have mitigated those initial awful drawings but on the contrary she is now accepting to show even worse drawings to the public . In this way she is not doing her job of respecting and taking into account the objections.

Once again, it all looks like her opinion was done before starting and for a reason that is not clear at all to the opinion of the residents.

As such, if the application were to go through I must admit I would have to agree with 2 other comments made by residents that it would be worth a public enquiry and/or that someone at the school has a very good friend at the Council Planning Departement.

So let me elaborate the comments on those scary amendments.

First of all, all my comments on the initial application of the Cavendish school are still valid. As such, this application shouldn' t even exist as more than 10 points of Camden policies are not respected at all (cf my husband and mine Objections previously sent in details).

More in details with the news drawings that are worse than the previous ones : Even higher for the front building, larger at the back and the hall even more massive : it 's even more an overdevelopment than before leading to the area to look like a nuclear power station in the middle of a residential area.  
How come Camden Council could authorize this ?

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**    **Comment:**    **Response:**

More in details then :

Front building :

Why is it even higher than in the initial drawings though it's already extremely massive ?

Why a plant room is authorized on the roof : it would be seen from the street and extremely ugly.

We have been refused to have a nice glass balustrade to be seen from the street on our application 2012/1115/P but when it's time for a business like this private school to show an ugly plant with brick wall very high for a plant ! Mrs Carr says hurrah. Why ? Why 2 weights and 2 measures depending on if the application is coming from a French resident or an English business ?

This plant would be higher than our house (33 Inverness) with a clear overlooking of our upper roof terrace : total lack of privacy+ worse there would be noise pollution day and night with the noise of this plant not only for our roof terrace but worse to our masterbedroom.

Let me remind you again and though I did say it yet to Mrs Carr that we have roof windows in our masterbedroom : the fact she does allow the school to build their plant of the roof and ventilation with all the noise associated is just shocking (less than 5 meters from my roof windows): how would we be able to sleep with the vibration and the noise all day and night not to speak that there would be no possible enjoyment of the terrace).

This plant has to be in the building and that's all ; such as all the other have to (cf substation of 35 Inverness street) : it's locked in a building not an open air plant. Why to accept privilege for this private school ?

Because they are an English business ? And us just a French family ? Who cares about the sleep of a French family after all here in Camden isn't it : French baching is pretended to be so fashionable those days in London with UKIP taking more and more power.

But, the fact Camden council would accept to grant this type of harmful application with those dramatic consequences clearly known for our family with a Cavendish school project so disrespectful of the resident neighbours I would rather call it open xenophobia/discrimination .

The rear of the front building is still too protuberant and it's compromising our sun and day light even more with the extra deep boxing Mrs Carr is accepting to show on those amended plans : once again we have said the back was a prejudice for our sun and light (cf our objections) and should set back from our property not to overshadow our premises and internal spaces.

The front part of the front building itself is still totally spoiling our front balcony with no respect of any kind of our right for right and the view we have on the market which is very unique.

The groundfloor is a total joke : it's absolutely ugly : it looks like a Mac Donald or Morrisson : traditional windows are a must and certainly not total glass doors that look ugly and like a front shop of cheap quality though it's a conservation and residential area.

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**

**Comment:**    **Response:**

Moreover, I don 't see why the Cavendish school is doing its best to be so noisily polluting us as usual . If they were to open their windows they have to open it on the other side not on us as showed on their drawings : their music room is going to be full of ugly sounds as I am afraid to say I never heard any Mozart so far at this young age in this school and I don 't see why we should accept to be polluted with those noise all day. So they have not to be able to leave the windows open such as they do In Arlington yet.

Concerning the look of the windows most particularly at the groundfloor level : it has to be in wood not in aluminium and it has to be traditional design to match with Camden probation center and our house and the ones of all the street. And I mean windows not a kind of foldind doors they are presenting all the way on the ground floor : or do they want to do stalls with fries to be sold on the street ?

The « brand »/logo itself of the school is ridiculously massive : welcome to Morrissons school. Why is it so massive ? Do residents have to see a supermarket look in their residential part street ? Does the council want the street to have a cheap look for attracting Krichna people to get their food at the school ?

There is something I don 't understand in the clear wish from the school and the council to ruin the aspect of this part of the street.  
What for ?Just for the school own selfish private lucrative interest (increase of number of fees/pupils) in breach of so many Camden policies ?

The hall itself once again is a joke : the new proposal is even higher though the 5 meters away from our house is not respected for this kind of increase of noise.

Also, it should be forbidden to let the windows open as it 's obvious that it's going to be Hell on Earth with 250 children in there shouting with microphones as the Cavendish school did allow it yet to happen this year for their school photograph.

Globally no care is taken at all by the school to be respectful of the neighbours.

So, the Council has to be vigilant from the beginning. As soon as the planning will be granted the school will take no care of the residents/neighbours.

Just BR are not enough to sound proof this hall (anyway it shouldn 't even exist cf our objections). Extra care should be given and certainly not to increase it to be so massive as the new drawings are showing.

The hall is too big, too high compromising our right for light and as we are already locked at the back by wall of the 35 we would be totally enclosed by this hall and the back wall of front building (not to mention to be locked in jail for our front balcony).

In a more general point of view this project is a massive overdevelopment of this land with no effort made at all for the « Green »/environmental aspects.

All the vegetations would be killed , killing the biodiversity. Vertical roofs walls are needed and green roofs too ( cf email sent by Mister Lazzaro Petragnoilli to Mrs Arbery in the pre app stage – I can communicate this email if needed-) where M. Petragnoilli the actual Mayor is very much

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**

**Comment:**    **Response:**

recommending the use of those vertical and green roofs for this application. Once again this recommendation hasn't been taken into account at all by the school neither by Mrs Carr in her guidance to the schools drawings after the 35 objections.

For example, the beautiful mature birch tree will be killed ( I don't see any survey concerning this tree in the application) and I can't see where it would be put (it's written somewhere). I wonder where somewhere when appart from brick and mortar of a nuclear plant station there is no extra inch of nature left alive in this application.

Not even balconies of baskets just nothing : just ugly tar and steel.

I though the Council wanted to make Camden to be a Greener place to be ? Is it ? It looks like a rather industrial look to be honest what Mrs Carr is pushing forward for this application though with 35 objections she already should have asked the school to withdraw their application. So for me there is an issue in teh procedure teh way the Council office ris dealing with this project not taking into account AT ALL the objections.

Let me also remind you that the school is pressuring us to sign party walls agreements since the beginning of their application being absolutely sure in advance the application will be 100% granted. How come they would know this in advance ? Strange isn't it ? Unfortunately, the attitude so far of Camden Council seems to prove the Cavendish school is right in thinking so and everything is already granted without taking any consideration of the numerous breaches in Camden planning policy neither of the 35 objections.

As a school they should show the example and this example is not only an architectural disaster totally ugly and massive that would spoil the street for the next centuries but it's not green/eco friendly at all and this is shocking. This is clearly an application against the environment.

\*Design and layout : ugly and massive not respecting the neighbours architecture neither the whole conservation area.

\*External appearance and materials : cheap : look of a supermarket : the brand itself of logo of the school is ridiculously massive

\*Loss of daylight sunlight and neighbours is total in front and at the back for our house and for the opposite neighbours too.

\*Noise nuisance : total from the hall and from the massive school run with the high increase of children when it's already a mess (cf all the objections of the residents).

\*Traffic and parking issues : cf our objections : where would vanish the 15 cars parked everyday in the actual car park of the Cavendish school?  
Massive traffic issue at school run with risk of death for children

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>*Use of land : overdevelopment of the project : loss of the parking for the school that would lead to traffic and parking issues Etc etc</p> <p>Cf the 35 objections from all the residents of Inverness street</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>Mister and Ms Gorodetska</p>

---

2014/3117/P	Dr Clare Taylor	40 Inverness Street NW1 7HB	06/10/2014 15:21:37	OBJ	<p>I OBJECT to this application.</p> <p>I have looked at the aesthetic of the new plan, and the height of the new building, and I can see no substantive differences.</p> <p>This building is completely out of keeping with the rest of the street, which consists mainly of grade 2 listed early Victorian buildings. This is an opportunity to enhance the street further, yet this monstrous design does the opposite.</p> <p>Just at the time when some of the story of this oasis in Camden is being preserved by the making of a film about it, this terribly insensitive proposal is put forward yet again.</p> <p>Gloucester Crescent is one of the finest terraces in the whole of London, and the only Italianate Victorian one anywhere in London. The top of Inverness Street is an important adjunct to that.</p> <p>Elsewhere in Camden, new building has been completely in keeping with the surroundings - for instance in Downshire Hill. The same should be the case here. This plan is for an industrial looking structure with METAL window frames, and a box on the top with aluminium doors. It should be made of RECLAIMED London stock brick (as the extension at 22 Gloucester Crescent has had to be) and with proper painted timber windows, framed in Portland stone.</p> <p>It is much too high, and much too close to the front of the plot. It will shade the street and the houses opposite.</p> <p>Despite many objections to the style and height of the proposed building nothing has been changed.</p>
-------------	-----------------	--------------------------------	---------------------	-----	---

---

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2014/3117/P	Bruce Fielding	37 Inverness Street NW1 7HB	06/10/2014 18:15:36	OBJ	<p>These plans are actually worse than the ones that they replace with regard to their impact on the neighbourhood, and residents.</p> <p>Please see my previous correspondence with regard to my specific objections - which haven't been addressed.</p> <p>I strongly object to the acceptance of these plans.</p>
2014/3117/P	Sir Roger Gifford	40 Inverness Street	11/10/2014 20:33:59	OBJ	<p>My strong objections to this planning application remain. 1. It is too high and a significant amount of light will be cut off from us on the important south side of Inverness Street - it is also higher than the adjacent house to the right and will look out of place. 2. Its ascetic is out of place in Inverness Street, not in keeping with existing buildings. It should look much more like its neighbours, or at least blend in with them, possibly also set back from the road more. 3. I also worry about on-street parking problems that will emerge from the lack of parking space inside the school which is being removed by this application.</p>