

### Comments Form

Name..... C.D. COOK and E.A. de Keller .....

Address..... 401 Brinsford Apartment, 25a Rylam Rd, Linton NW5 3EH .....

Email address..... [REDACTED] .....

Telephone number..... [REDACTED] .....

Planning application number..... 2014/795/P .....

Planning application address..... Imperial works Perron St NW5 3ED .....

I support the application (please state reasons below)

I object to the application (please state reasons below)

Your comments

Please see attached letter - also sent by e-mail.

Please continue on extra sheets if you wish

as sent by e-mail-

---

Tel	[REDACTED]	401 Brinsmead Apartments
e mail	[REDACTED]	25a Ryland Road
		London NW5 3EH

---

Planning Department  
By email to [planning@camden.gov.uk](mailto:planning@camden.gov.uk)

for the attention of Jennifer Chivers

8 Feb 2014

Dear Ms Chivers

re: 2014/7951/P, Imperial Works Perren Street NW5 3ED

We are writing to object to the proposed roof extension to the above premises.

1 Our principal concern is, that in responding to the previous scheme for two penthouse type flats turned down on appeal in 2000, the new architect appears to ignore the fact of a major change from commercial to residential in what is referred to as 'Portland House', [ie now 'Brinsmead'] to the north of Imperial Works. There are photographs and drawings seeking to show how the new design meets the earlier objections, but which omit entirely any consideration of our building - or literally, our point of view - from the north towards Imperial Works.

2 We therefore wish to object on the following 2 grounds:

a Overlooking and loss of privacy via the proposed large glass windows and the 'break out' area to the north side of Imperial Works;

b The blocking of views from our flats, visual intrusion and loss of light.

Both these factors affect Brinsmead flats facing Imperial Works to a greater or lesser degree [especially 203,303,403, 501,201,301,401] and the as yet unoccupied new flats on the first and ground floors of the Brinsmead building.

3 Furthermore it is contradictory for the applicant to imply the need for substantial additional commercial space when the two floors below the proposed additions have been vacant for months. Under section 14 'Existing Use' in the Application for Planning Permission, the site is entered as Not Vacant, which is at best partly true.

4 In the same Section 14 the current use of the site is described as 'Offices Class B1a and a single residential unit Class C3'. However in

Section 18 'All Types of Development: Non-residential Floorspace' the existing premises and the proposed extensions are classified as B1c [Light industrial]. If this is correctly entered then this implies a major change of use against which further objections might be lodged. IT WOULD BE HELPFUL IF YOU COULD LOOK INTO THIS AND PUBLICISE ANY CONFIRMATION OR OTHERWISE OF THIS PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE.

5 With reference to Section 17 'Residential Units', the 'loss or gain of residential units' is not obvious from the drawings.

Please let us know of the council's decision. If officers are minded to approve the application, then we would like it referred to committee and please notify us of any hearing date.

Yours sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

Christopher Cook [Professor] and Elizabeth de Keller [Ms]