

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/0493/P	Richard Harding	62 Gloucester Crescent NW1 7EG	13/03/2015 13:59:52	SUPPRT	<p>I would like to support this application.</p> <p>The site is visible from our current house on Gloucester Crescent, and we lived directly opposite (43 Inverness Street) from 1995 to 2006.</p> <p>The area will be greatly improved by the use of this site as a dwelling, rather than commercial premises (or sitting empty). Commercial use is now anomalous and unsuitable for that end of Inverness Street.</p> <p>As for the architectural design, my view is that it is entirely suitable for the area. An 1840s pastiche would be aesthetically unfortunate, not least because it would unbalance the symmetry of the rows of houses at that end of the street. Such a requirement would also be unnecessary, given the appropriate modern architecture at various nearby locations.</p> <p>In short, the proposed development would be a considerable and welcome improvement to the area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/0493/P	Roger Oakley	2 Fleet Road LONDON NW3 2QS	16/03/2015 09:31:16	OBJLETTE R	Planning application no. 2015/0493/P 46 Inverness Street London NW1 7HB

Dear Sirs

I act for Mr & Mrs David Gentleman, the owners of 25 Gloucester Crescent, London NW1, a property which backs onto the proposed development at 46 Inverness Street. My clients are extremely concerned about the proposed development and they have asked me to submit an objection on their behalf.

I have seen the daylight and sunlight report prepared by Malcolm Hollis. I am not a right of light expert, but it does appear that the construction of this building will seriously affect the amount of daylight at the rear of my client's property which, because of its northeast facing elevation, has a limited amount of light, particularly at the lower levels as it is.

Elevation 2 on the architects drawing 214/EX/05 shows part of the rear elevation of 25 Gloucester Crescent. Section CC and EE on drawing 214/P/02 shows the potential impact in the narrow gap which occurs between 24 Gloucester Crescent and 46 Inverness Street.

The bulk of the proposed development, being 3 storeys high including the semi-basement, seems too much and the design of the building fails to complement the design of the attractive existing early Victorian buildings.

My clients would urge you to give consideration to rejecting the application or at best reducing the height of the building.

I would be grateful if you could confirm receipt of this letter.

Yours faithfully
Roger Oakley FRICS
Roger Oakley & Co
Chartered Surveyors

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/0493/P	David Gentleman	25 Gloucester Crescent London NW1 7DL	17/03/2015 09:50:37	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this planning proposal. It intends to replace an unassuming one-storey building, which has become derelict and clearly needs attention, with a design for a squeezed-in-looking two-storey house and basement whose height and scale does not relate to the adjoining houses and which fails to acknowledge or relate to its setting.</p> <p>The site is at an important junction in a conservation area where this still intact end of Inverness Street joins Gloucester Crescent. The recent well-designed building diagonally opposite it is well set back from the street, but the proposed new building is intrusive and wholly unsuitable here, where it is at odds with the scale and character of the houses on either side of it.</p> <p>Its height takes the light from the neighbouring gardens in the Crescent and obscures their views to and from Inverness Street.</p>
2015/0493/P	Sue Atkinson	301 The Glass Building 226 Arlington Road	17/03/2015 22:07:53	COMMEMP ER	<p>I write in support of this application. I am delighted that such an interesting building is proposed for this site. I walk past this building on most days and the current single story building is an eye sore. It will be excellent to have a 3 story residence to replace it. The whole area is a residential area and needs to be encouraged to remain so. This will be a delightful addition to residential property in the area. I have no objection to this planning application.</p>