

Eimear Heavey
Camden Planning Officer
Camden Planning
London Borough of Camden
2nd Floor, 5 Pancras Square
c/o Town Hall, Judd Street
London
WC1H 9JE

18 February 2015

Dear Sir or Madam,

private and confidential
-this letter is not for online publication

RE: URGENT - LETTER OF OBJECTION TO PLANNING
APPLICATION PROPOSALS AT NO. 82 GUILFORD STREET
AFFECTING MY PROPERTY AT NO. 81 GUILFORD STREET

I was notified only today by the surveyor of No. 82 Guilford Street of the planning application lodged with Camden Planning by the owners of No. 82 Guilford Street back in September 2014.

Seonaid Carr, Planning Officer, confirmed on the phone today that our client, the owner of No. 81 Guilford Street, had not been notified by Camden Planning. It is a legal requirement for owners of neighbouring properties to be notified of planning applications by the Council.

In sum, No. 82's planning application 2014/5232/P and 2014/5689/L propose a 4-storey rear elevation that will fill the whole of their rear terrace and look over the property at No. 81. It will harm privacy, obscure views out of and light to the property, and harms a major Listed Building feature of the rear elevation of no. 82, 81, 80 and 79 Guilford Street.

I wish to object completely for the following reasons:

private and confidential

1. On Listed Building grounds

-Our team at no. 81 was very sensitive to the Listed Building needs of the rear elevation of No. 82, 81, 80 and 79 Guilford Street, last year. We proposed only to extend at the rear on the ground floor to match that of No.80.

-The rear extension was deliberately conceived as a glass conservatory in order to preserve and be mindful of sight lines along the curvature of the existing brick walls of the properties at No. 79 to 82. Looking from the garden, there is still a beautiful sense of the houses retreating consecutively further back towards No. 82.

-No. 82's proposal fully and completely destroys this visual curvature of the rear of these Listed Building houses.

-In addition, It doesn't seem appropriate that No. 80 and 81 were asked to build mindful to this curvature (which we have done) but No. 82 would not be. They should be, in our opinion, asked to withdraw their application immediately.

private and confidential

2. On planning precedence

-Planning permission was granted for a rear extension to No. 81 last year.

-Following a planning application submitted for No. 80 for a very tall rear extension our team submitted two additional planning applications in the Autumn 2013 to match the neighbouring proposals.

- Our two extra planning applications were to extend our rear elevation for 4-5 storeys of the main part of our house by about 5-6ft to match the rear elevation of the main house at No. 80.

-We were instructed to pull these two extra plans out immediately by Camden Planning, which we did in good faith. And No. 80 had to pull theirs as well.

-Our client was not refunded the £1500 paid for these applications, despite an understanding that this money would be refunded or go towards the cost of a planning meeting. This meeting was never organised by Camden Council for us, despite repeated requests.

-No. 82's proposal would go against precedence since no. 80 and no.81 were not allowed to extend the rear of their main houses at all. It is surprising that you have not at this stage asked No. 82 to pull their proposal completely as we were last year. Please can you explain why?

-Because of this planning precedence No. 82 should not be allowed to have their planning application approved.

private and confidential

3. On loss of light and feeling of privacy and space

-Although a tower block of flats is visible to the east of the garden of the property at No. 81, the windows do not directly overlook the property. The main view from No. 81 is towards a tree at the rear of the garden.

-The tower block-type building proposed at No. 82, however, does directly overlook No. 81's maisonette rear extension and rear garden/terrace, whereas the existing tower block is set back.

-The proposed rear building at No. 82 would bring a new tower block-type buildings closer to the property at No. 81, and part of it right by the boundary wall. This is unacceptable. It would seriously affect the property's right to light, feeling of privacy and space that it currently enjoys as well raise issues of fire separation and life safety concerns.

private and confidential

4. Speedy response requested

-I would request an immediate meeting and response from Camden Planning. The flats are on the market, and this proposal seriously harms the Listed Building and current benefits of the property at no.81 as it stands currently alongside no.82.

-I request that no.82's planning application be withdrawn immediately.

*

I look forward to your urgent reply to address these matters.

Thank you in your anticipation of your help.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'AD', is written over a horizontal line.

Adrian Friend
for and on behalf of Friend and Company Ltd