

**Dike, Darlene**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 03 April 2016 23:06  
**To:** Planning  
**Cc:** Whittingham, Gideon; Minty, Stuart; Francis.Wheat@camden.gov.uk  
**Subject:** OBJECTION to planning application 2016/0321/P for 6 Coptic Street London WC1A 1NH

Sirs,

I write to register my objection to the London Borough of Camden (Camden) to application number 2016/0321/P for 6 Coptic Street London WC1A 1NH. I am resident at The Flat, 3 Stedham Place, London WC1A 1HU, which is immediately adjacent to the proposed development.

I'd like to think this application has been made against the advice of Camden officers, and that they intend to reject it through delegated powers.

A very similar application was made back in 2013 (number 2013/5970/P). After a big dollop of maladministration on the part of Camden officers, including failing to publicise documents that form part of the registration requirements, Camden officers recommended the application for approval.

The Development Management Committee rejected the application through unanimous vote — an extremely rare occurrence. The chair commented it was "very badly presented". Subsequently, the Head of Development Management told me she was looking into what had gone wrong. I heard nothing back, although I understand she was subsequently promoted.

Since then, the following changes to the application have been made:

1. The property was sold to a new developer
2. A posh planning consultant was appointed
3. The design was tweaked on the southern elevation, towards sites recently redeveloped as luxury town houses, advertised at £3m+. Presumably they are only concerned about civil action for loss of light.

You'd expect a labour-run borough would want to help the ~40 people living to the north and east of the proposed development, mostly in public housing, and at risk of significant loss of amenity. You'd also think they would want to do a great job this time around. Apparently not!

Neither a postal nor an email notification of this application has been received at my address. I am fortunate to have been contacted by neighbours. The missing letter is presumably because we are still not listed as a neighbour on the application, despite objecting last time, and pointing out the issue specifically for this application. In fact, just 4 of the 20+ addresses to the north and east are listed — Camden has listed fewer affected properties than the developer has!

On this basis, I respectfully suggest Camden should do at least as much work as the developer to work out who the neighbours are, actually contact them, and extend the consultation so that they may respond.

I imagine the developer will read this, and they should insist Camden does the consultation work that the application fee pays for. After all, nobody wants this process to be open to challenge.

The responsible planning officer has promised to send me a formal notification (and offered a meeting), but the notification still has not arrived. I've given up waiting, and I am responding now anyway.

There are plentiful grounds for officers to reject this application under delegated powers. However, and despite the ramshackle administration of Camden Council, there are two other objections registered. Therefore, any approval should be referred to the members briefing panel, with a view to a hearing at the Development Management Committee.

The reasons for my objection are those on which the application was previously rejected, copied below, all of which still apply. The responsible planning officer will be familiar with these, since he was also responsible for the previous application.

Thanks,  
Chris

#### Reasons 1

The proposed rear extension, by reason of its bulk, mass and terminating height would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host building and of this part of the Bloomsbury conservation area, contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

#### Reasons 2

The proposed roof extension, by reason of its design, form, bulk, location in a pair of buildings unimpaired by later additions and removal of original roof form would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host building, the pair of buildings of which it forms part and of this part of the Bloomsbury conservation area, contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

#### Reasons 3

The proposed rear closet wing extension by reason of its height and location would result in a loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers by virtue of the impact on sunlight, daylight and sense of enclosure to the adjoining roof terrace and windows at 5 and 7 Coptic Street, contrary to policy CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development) the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy; and Policy DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.