

1 Colville Place
London W1T 2B

Tania Skelli-Yaoz
Planning Services
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street WC1H 8ND

12 October 2014

Dear Tania,

Ref: 2013/8158/P: 27-29 Whitfield Street W1:

I am writing as the owner occupier and the architect of 1 Colville Place (Listed Grade II) to object to the proposed development on the grounds of loss of amenity, harm to the character of the Conservation Area and serious detriment to the setting of the listed building at 1 Colville Place.

1.0 Proposed Roof Extension:

The scarcity of information provided makes it very difficult to fully assess the damaging impact on the listed building at 1 Colville Place.

There are no sections showing the difference in levels between the existing and proposed terrace and extension. There is no elevation showing the view of the proposed extension from the terrace at No 1, including details of the proposed new dividing wall between the two terraces.

I had understood that this had been requested from the applicants.

All the roof extensions on the North side of Colville Place broadly align and none project beyond that at No 1.

The proposed extension would project 600 mm in front of the line of the existing at No1 Colville Place. This in itself would be damaging of this listed building, but, in addition to projecting 600 mm, it rises 3.5 m above the height of the existing dividing wall, (4.9 m above 1 Colville Place terrace level).

Further adding to the impact of the bulk, due to the difference in levels, the dividing wall between the two terraces would need to be substantially raised along the entire length.

The mass of the proposed extension would completely dominate the listed building, indeed subsume it.

continues to next page

The proposal is also harmful to the character of the Conservation Area due to its height and mass in relation to the rest of the terrace.

In addition to the immense damage to the setting of the listed building, there would be serious loss of amenity in terms of outlook and loss of morning sun.

Contrary to policies DP24(a) & (b) & 24.13 DP 25 (g) & 25.15.

The proposal also does not meet the criteria of NPPF in respect of Heritage Assets para 132:

“As Heritage Assets are irreplaceable any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a Grade II listed building should be exceptional.”

No clear and convincing justification has been put forward.

In relation to para 134:

On the basis of the analysis of the proposal and its harmful impact on the listed building, it is not accepted that the proposal will lead to less than substantial harm.

The demonstrable harm the the development would cause to the setting of the listed building is certainly not outweighed by the very minimal, if any, public gain offered.

2.0 Colville Place Elevation:

The change to the fenestration is damaging not only to the listed building, but to the terrace as a whole. No contextual drawing showing the relationship to the terrace has been provided.

The existing 1.5 m wide band of solid, even if no longer raised, is important in relation to the setting of 1 Colville Place, both in terms of the visual separation between the buildings and the verticality it provides. Its reduction by 0.5 M, together with the greatly increased size of windows, completely changes the balance between the two buildings.

The change also disregards the traditional hierarchy of window size, thereby changing the balance between solid and void with consequent damage, not only to the setting of the listed building, but to the adjoining terrace as a whole and consequently harmful to the character of the Conservation Area.

Contrary to policies DP25(g) & 25.15 DP24(a) 7 (b) & 224.13.

continues to next page

3.0 Roof Terraces:

3.1 4th floor roof terrace:

The proposal to use the roof of the 3rd floor extension as an amenity space is quite unacceptable. Users would look down directly down onto the roof terrace most directly at No 1, but also on to those at No 2 and No 3 Colville Place.

Contrary to policy DP26(a) 26.2 & 26.3.

The suggestion that setting the balustrade back by 0.5 m would overcome this is quite fallacious.

The roof should be conditioned for access for maintenance purposes only during working hours.

3.2 Existing roofs at 1st and 2nd floor levels:

These areas of roof have never been used for any purpose except maintenance. They are however described by the applicants as 'terraces' and shown as green areas on the submitted plans. To allow these roofs to be used for any other purpose would be quite unacceptable to the amenity in terms of noise and overlooking to the residential occupiers in Colville Place and in Goodge Street.

These roof areas should also be conditioned for maintenance purpose only during normal working hours.

4.0 Ventilation plant:

I remain of the view that both in terms of design, bulk and amenity any proposed plant should be located in the basement.

In relation to the current proposal - on 3rd April 2014, I sent a report by acoustic consultants Bickerdike and Alan, who having taken noise readings and assessed the applicant's proposals submitted as part of the planning application. They have concluded that the plant currently proposed would not meet the Council's requirements in terms of noise reductions (see the penultimate paragraph of their Report), and it follows would cause noise nuisance. The conclusion of the Bickerdike and Alan's report calls for a rather more substantive response than that given by the applicants in their letter of 14 July 2014.

DP28 explicitly states that developments that exceed the Council's noise levels will not be permitted. This is such a case.

For the foregoing reasons, the application should be refused.

Yours sincerely

Max Neufeld.