

**Muthoora, Leela**

---

**Subject:** FW: 64 GRAFTON WAY, W1 Application 2014/7742/P

**From:** Bill Tyler  
**Sent:** 03 February 2015 18:39  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** 64 GRAFTON WAY, W1 Application 2014/7742/P

Dear  
Sirs

3/2/2015

I am writing on behalf of Diana Tyler (Freeholder) and MBA Literary Agents Ltd (Leaseholder) of the adjoining property to No 64 at 62 Grafton Way, the last in the terrace of listed Georgian town houses in Grafton Way to the east of No 64. A formal objection has been lodged on the Council's website with a note that this more full response was to follow.

1. No 64 is a very distinctive corner building that forms a quite dramatic 'bookend' to the terrace of Georgian town houses on the northerly side of Grafton Way and, in its fashion, quite successfully addresses the need for a notable elevation to both Grafton Way and Whitfield Street. It is an important visual marker in this part of the Conservation Area.
2. The exterior is in a relatively poor state of repair and many timber windows, perhaps the originals, have been replaced with inappropriate metal casements. A two-storey rear wing on Whitfield Street is a later addition. In its present condition the building detracts from the appearance of the Conservation Area.
3. Whilst some intensification of residential use - compared to the existing - may well be appropriate there needs to be a balance between what is acceptable in terms of residential need and local amenity. The use of the ground floor and basement for café or restaurant purposes has been entirely appropriate in this location over a number of years and, with outside seating in summer especially, it has provided street-level vibrancy to this corner location.
4. The proposed restaurant would appear to be unworkable; the very small basement kitchen - it has no preparation space for raw food and also has a toilet directly off it - will not be able to service the number of ground floor tables that have no service station at that level. All service is apparently to be on foot to/from the basement via a tight winding stair without the benefit of even a dumb waiter. These impractical aspects will result in the ground floor remaining unusable and unoccupied to the detriment of the local vibrant street scene.
5. Officer comment has already been made about the unsuitability of basement and ground floor residential use (Flat 1) in

this location and to which I would add support. A larger part of the basement should be used for kitchen purposes for the

restaurant. The impractical bin store in the under-pavement vault should be re-located to where Bedroom 2 is shown and

with a platform hoist to street level in the basement area light-well.

6. The wholly impractical basement bike store (too small and only accessible by stairs from street level) together with bin

storage for the residential units could sensibly be located in what is presently proposed as the lounge/kitchen of Flat 1.

7. Although the Applicant's team make much of the 'extract chimney' - shown on third and fourth floor plans - that surmounts

the rear extension, and presumably is for extraction from the restaurant and its kitchen, it does not appear on lower floor

plans and how it would wind its way from ground to third floor from the front part of the building to the rear via rooms in flats

2, 3 and 4 is not shown. This will be significant in noise attenuation issues and indeed in room layouts and ductwork.

8. Little regard has been given to location of rooms above/below each other and although sound attenuation may in theory deal

with problems between living rooms and bedrooms it would be more sensible to design layouts so that room uses are

'stacked'.

9. The positioning of kitchens and bathrooms seems almost random throughout and a leaking shower or sink could cause

havoc in the living space below. It is normal good practice to, again, stack these uses and to simplify service runs,

especially waste pipework from baths, showers and toilets.

10. It is not clear from the floor plans whether new the upper floors of the rear extension extend over the party wall with No

62 as there is a discrepancy with what is shown on the first and second floor plans and the floor above and below. This

should be clarified.

The above planning and practicality issues are considered to be sufficient to require further thought to be given to the proposed alterations before planning permission is granted for an amended scheme. I and my Clients trust that the Council shares this view and that the application, as it stands, will be refused.

Yours faithfully

Bill Tyler

Bill Tyler RIBA IHBC  
22 Southern Road  
London N2 9LE

64 GraftonWay W1