

Comments Form

Name.....*John Knight*.....

Address.....*13 Bar. Chastomew. Villas. NW. 5. 26.*.....



Planning application number.....*2013/8158/P*.....

Planning application address.....*Cyclone House 27-29 Whitfield St.*.....


~~I support the application~~ (please state reasons below)

I object to the application (please state reasons below)

WITZSE

Your comments

The revised proposals do nothing to overcome the fundamental objections raised in my letter of the 28th October 2014.



10.12.14

Please continue on extra sheets if you wish

Tania Skelli-Yaoz
Camden Council
Planning Department/Development Control
5 St Pancras Sq
London N1C 4AG

23 DEC 2014

By email and Post

22 December 2014

Dear Tania Skelli Yaoz

Planning Reference 2013/8158/P: 27/29 Whitfield St W1

You may recall I submitted observations on the first application objecting to the proposed extension and elevational treatment; part of the reason was because I consider it will do considerable harm to the setting of the adjacent listed building (1 Colville Place - a building that I assisted getting listed Grade 2) and will visually damage the conservation area, especially the view of the whole of Colville Place with its uniform height up to and including the corner of Whitfield St (number 27/29 Whitfield Street).

Thank you for informing me that revised drawings have been submitted; however clearly whomever checked these drawings and hence validated them, did not do a professional job, as the floor to ceiling heights are wrong, the parapet heights are incorrect, the overall height of the proposed building is at variance with all other measurements included on previously submitted drawings and yet somehow the applicant claims the building is the same height. The erroneous drawings show the neighbouring roof terrace level of No 1 Colville Place half way up the doors serving the terrace, and the parapet wall heights between the two properties remain incorrect by at least 80 cm (just under three feet).

Can you please assure me that you will be requiring the applicant to resubmit accurate drawings and once you have these you will inform me so that I can make comments. To do so without proper drawings would be like entering a hall of mirrors as there is no agreed base line as to what is accurate and what is at issue.

To consider the application without accurate drawings would be clearly represent maladministration as how would anyone be able to ascertain what actually might be agreed to or not agreed to.

May I suggest that once you get revised drawings that you personally check them; considering they were submitted as a consequence of comments concerning the inaccuracy of the previously submitted drawings, it must be very frustrating and wasteful in time and energy for you as it certainly is for those who have bothered to make comments, to realise that the applicant continues to submit misinformation. Maybe that is because if accurate drawings were submitted the inappropriateness of the bulky extension and consequential damage to neighbours amenity would be even more evident.

I look forward to hearing from you.


Jim Monahan

cc Conservation Officer: Hannah Walker
Councillor Adam Harrison