

**Camden Council Customer feedback and enquiries**  
**Comments on a current Planning Application - Ref. 17707665**

---

**Planning Application Details**

Year	2015
Number	4396
Letter	P
Planning application address	152 Royal College Street
Title	Mr.
Your First Name	Eric
Initial	
Last Name	Thirer
Organisation	
Comment Type	Object
Postcode	NY 10024-2047
Address line 1	42 West 89th Street
Address line 2	Apartment A
Address line 3	New York
Postcode	NY 10024-2047

Your comments on the planning application

I own a unit in the Bruges Place complex immediately behind the proposed new construction.

I have read all the technical and design reports but nevertheless have some objections:

1. The proposed design is completely contrary to the style of the adjoining traditional shops along Royal College Street. No use of London yellow stock bricks as seen all over this area of Camden.

## Camden Council Customer feedback and enquiries Comments on a current Planning Application - Ref. 17707665

---

### Planning Application Details

2. The completed height with the enormous sombre and aggressive chimney dominating the site, is far too 'industrial' for the neighborhood. I would liken this to a crematorium smoke stack, not helped by the overall style of the roof finishing.

3. My apartment terrace and windows face the proposed building - I would like to see the height reduced to match the existing row of houses.

**If you wish to upload a file containing your comments then use the link below**

No files attached


### About this form

Issued by

Camden Council  
Customer feedback and enquiries  
Camden Town Hall  
Judd Street  
London WC1H 9JE

Form reference

17707665



To Kathryn Moran

I strongly wish to object to the planning application number 2015/4396/P - 152 College Street, I am writing on behalf of myself and the owner of No 1 Bruges Place Eric Thirer.

This application is totally out of keeping with the terrace of neighbouring houses.

I own two properties in Bruges place one of which is directly behind the proposed building. Both are tenanted so I did not receive notice of these works before now.

The increased proposed height of this building will affect the view and light to our building and substantially reduce the outlook from the Bruges place balconies.

We totally concur with the objections raised by others:

Scale & Size - this proposal is 1 floor taller than the adjacent historic building. The attic of existing building is not habitable, this proposal exploits the space of the attic and pushes the roof up.

It appears to be trying to set a precedent to add an extra floor to Nos 154-156 when they are eventually demolished and rebuilt.

Why is there such a huge chimney? What is this for, why does it go up at least an extra storey? Note image 3DModel01 (which is also used in the DAS) cuts off the top of the chimney.

Look of the Building - it is terribly ugly and looks to dominate the prominent corner. There is nothing soft and appealing about it.

The choice of precast concrete is totally out of keeping with the area. It will not weather and mellow like brick.

The idea that this proposal can be compared with 83 RCS is deluded. That is an attractive intervention with amusing use of high quality materials and clever details. It slips in between 2 existing buildings.

This proposal is a monolith with slabs of pinkish concrete and glass. It is slapped on the end of the terrace; it just shouts ugliness. The huge chimney is very disturbing.

Regards  
Nikki Newman