

Ms Jennifer Chivers
Development Control
Planning and Public Protection
Camden Town Hall
Argyle Street
London
WC1H 8EQ

29th December 2015

BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Ms Chivers,

75 Bayham Street, London NW1 0AA - Application No: 2015/6036P

On behalf of my client, Formedge Limited, we hereby object to the development proposed at the above property (hereinafter referred to as 'the Property').

My client owns 6a / 6b Pratt Street and Regent House, 1 - 6 Pratt Mews (hereinafter referred to as 'Regent House') which share a significant boundary with the Property to the north and west respectively. Please find a site plan attached to this letter showing my client's property ownerships outlined in blue and red. These properties are currently in office use.

As you are no doubt aware Regent House benefits from an extant planning permission (2013/7739/P granted on 12th February 2015) for:

Demolition of existing building and erection of a 3 storey mixed use building including office (B1a) at ground floor level and 1 x 1 bedroom studio unit, 5 x 2-bedroom and 2 x 3-bedroom self-contained flats (Class C3) on upper floors.

My client intends to commence demolition of Regent House in March 2016 and begin the development of this scheme thereafter.

We believe that the proposed design makes no allowance for this extant planning permission. The proposed alterations to the Property would have a negative impact on the outlook and amenity of future occupiers of the proposed apartments, which have habitable rooms facing the Property. We believe the application is contrary to policy CS5 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy, policy DP26 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies and Camden Planning Guidance 6, which refers to protection of outlook and amenity of occupiers adjoining proposed developments.

Specifically, we have concerns regarding the following aspects of the proposed design at the Property;

Roof Extension to Main Building – the proposed additional floor on top of the existing building creates potential for a loss of natural light and loss of amenity for current office users and potential future residential occupiers of the apartments in the extant permission.

Roof Terrace – the proposed roof terrace on the existing flat roof immediately adjoins my client's property. The current situation on site is that my client has six windows which are located immediately on the boundary of the Property. These windows are in constant use. The applicant's proposed drawings (section BB) states that four of the windows of my client's property have roller shutters which are 'permanently closed'. This is not that case. A picture (No 8, page C3) contained in the applicants Basement Impact Assessment shows at least one of the 'permanently closed' windows is open. The proximity of these windows needs to be considered in terms of the potential impact of the roof terrace and rear extension on the current office users. As aforementioned in this letter, the extant planning permission provides for habitable room windows which are located immediately on the boundary of the proposed roof terrace. Clearly the proposed roof terrace will have a very negative impact on the amenity of future residential occupiers of these apartments in terms of outlook, noise, disturbance etc.

Rear Extension – the proposed rear extension (on top of the current flat roof), will project significantly from the existing rear building line of the Property and come significantly closer to my client's property than is currently the case. It will also incorporate a bi fold door which will provide access to the aforementioned roof terrace. We object to the principle of a rear extension and bi fold doors on the basis of loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of amenity and outlook from the offices and also the apartments proposed in the extant planning permission.

Enlarged rear windows – the new enlarged windows proposed into the rear wall of the existing property will look directly at the rear windows of Regent House and again we believe that there will be a negative impact on future occupiers of the apartments granted permission in the extant permission.

In conclusion, we believe the application is contrary to policy CS5 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy, policy DP26 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies and Camden Planning Guidance 6 and as such would cause demonstrable harm that would warrant refusal of this planning application.


I look forward to confirmation that you have received this letter at your earliest convenience. Should you have any queries please contact my office at michael@hanily.com

Yours sincerely,



HANILY MCGARRY PROPERTY MRICS, MRTPI

Encl: Site Plan



General notes:

This drawing is copyright of KSR architects. This drawing must be read in conjunction with the conditions of sale, assessment, specification and all other relevant documents and drawings. KSR architects accept no liability for any expense, loss or damage of whatsoever nature and however arising from any reliance placed on this drawing or in the execution of the work to which it relates which has not been referred to them and their approval of it in writing.
 Unless stated on this drawing or the digital data, only figured dimensions are to be used. For "finish square" to mean square.
 Check all dimensions on site.

Project:
**REGENT HOUSE
 Pratt Mews
 London NW1 0AD**

KSRARCHITECTS

125, Holland Road, London NW1 0DB
 Tel: +44 (0)20 7592 9000
 Email: info@ksrarchitects.com
 Website: www.ksrarchitects.com

File:
LOCATION PLAN

PLANNING

Issue for PLANNING

Rev: None
 0 KSR architects

2011.10

Summary by

Child

Rev'd 21.06.11

Drawn by: LV

Checked by: GJ

Scale: 1:1250 @ A4

Project Ref:

Drawing Ref:

Revision:

PRT

PRT - PL2 - 001

.