

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1093/P	Jane Moore	55A Gray's Inn Road WC1X 8PP	26/04/2016 07:16:31	OBJ	<p>OBJECTION TO APPLICATION 2016/1093/P: 20-21 King's Mews</p> <p>As the long-term leaseholder to the residential floors of No 55 Gray's Inn Road, which lies directly adjacent to the proposed development at 20-21 Kings Mews, I wish to register my strongest objection to this proposal.</p> <p>My objection is based on the following grounds:</p> <p>Height, bulk and massing</p> <p>The height, bulk and mass of the scheme is too large, especially when the additional plant on the roof is also considered. This will increase the height on site from two storeys to four residential storeys plus plant; effectively four storeys above ground level. This is entirely inappropriate in a Mews context and will negatively impact the properties which back onto the site from Gray's Inn Road. The proposal will create an unbearable sense of enclosure to the rear of my property and it is this rear aspect that currently provides the breathing space for the house as the front of the property faces the busy Gray's Inn Road.</p> <p>Furthermore the site sits within the Hatton Garden Conservation Area and adjacent to the Bloomsbury Conservation Area. Allowing a third storey and a plant unit to sit exposed at the top of the building will add too much bulk, is ugly and does not offer a good enough design solution for the conservation area. While previous consents have been granted at three storeys this scheme pushes those heights and seeks to add further mass by the inclusion of bulky plant on the roof. Even without the plant unit, three stories is excessive in the context, the context being the relatively lower and smaller house behind it (my house, at 55 Gray's Inn Road), which is therefore much more severely impacted by three storeys on the Mews compared to the bigger buildings on Gray's Inn Road to the south.</p> <p>The design fails to meet Policy DP 24: Securing high quality design, and which states that the Council will require all developments, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest standard of design and will expect developments to consider: a) character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings; b) the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed; c) the quality of materials to be used; d) the provision of visually interesting frontages at street level.</p> <p>Negative impact to streetscape and conservation area and on the setting of Grade II listed building at 55 Gray's Inn Road</p> <p>The proposal is completely out of character with the Conservation area and fundamentally changes the light industrial nature of the Mews and the natural height and hierarchy of a Mews.</p> <p>The proposal will overly dominate and overbear the Grade II listed building at 55 Gray's Inn Road which dates from around 1714 and which comprises a shopfront for a restaurant and dwelling above. At the moment the context provides low rise buildings of appropriate scale and building material which sit</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

well with the house. The size and mass of the proposal are inappropriate in context and will detract from the current setting of the listed dwelling. Traditionally the Mews were to sit at a lower height in respect of the main buildings on the primary street in front of them. This development breaks the characteristic relationship between the buildings by pushing the mass to four residential storeys plus plant; bringing it too close in height to the buildings on Gray's Inn Road for the historic relationship to be visible.

The scheme fails to respond to the requirements of high quality design as sought by NPPF paragraph 58 which requires schemes to respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation and similarly fails Camden's Core Strategy Policy CS14. Nor does it meet Policy DP25 which seeks to conserve Heritage including within Conservation Areas and to Listed Buildings.

Light and privacy

This site is to the west of 55 Gray's Inn Road and the proposal will increase the height such that it will reduce the daylight and sunlight received by rooms to the rear of my property, in particular the proposal will severely impact the first and second floor rooms, which include the main living areas.

By virtue of the narrow distance between the proposal and my house the occupants of the new scheme will also overlook my property and my privacy will be lost. The wall of the new building, together with its windows, will be between 8 metres and something less than 11 metres from my windows. This will not only create a suffocating sense of enclosure, but will enclose the last outward aspect that exists for my property, hemmed in as it is to the immediate south by the bulk of the neighbouring building (Gray's Inn Court) and to the immediate north by the tall buildings along Northington Street.

I consider this to be a failing with regard to Camden's Core Strategy Policy CS5 (d) protecting and enhancing our environment and heritage and the amenity and quality of life of local communities and CS5 (e) The Council will protect the amenity of Camden's residents and those working in and visiting the borough by: e) making sure that the impact of developments on their occupiers and neighbours is fully considered.

In this regard the proposal wholly fails to meet policy DP 26: Managing the Impact of Development on Occupiers and Neighbours which states that the Council will 'protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity. The factors we will consider include: a) visual privacy and overlooking; b) overshadowing and outlook; c) sunlight, daylight and artificial light levels'.

Loss of employment

This scheme will lead to the loss of a relatively affordable employment space suitable for an independent trader. The garage provides an important local service and fewer and fewer such premises exist, making it increasingly hard to find mechanics in London who can fix a car promptly as the few

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:****Comment:** **Response:**

remaining mechanics have more work than they can handle. Instead of delivering the NPPF requirement to build a strong economy this scheme ends existing strong and varied economic users and does not reprovide for them, going against NPPF paragraphs 21 and 23. Increasingly these types of businesses are being forced out of central London and so are the people who make their living in them.

I consider this to be a failing with regard to Camden's Core Strategy Policy CS5 (d) protecting and enhancing our environment and heritage and the amenity and quality of life of local communities. It also fails to meet Policy CS 7 (g) protecting and promoting small and independent shops, and resisting the loss of shops where this would cause harm to the character and function of a centre; and also policy CS 8 b) support Camden's industries by: - safeguarding existing employment sites and premises in the borough that meet the needs of modern industry and other employers; c) expect a mix of employment facilities and types, including the provision of facilities suitable for small and medium sized enterprises, such as managed, affordable workspace; and f) recognise the importance of other employment generating uses, including retail, markets, leisure, education, tourism and health.

Poor quality of residential dwellings proposed

The design of the residential units proposed is poor as the seven units are all small and the light within the scheme to the apartments is poor quality. They also fail to meet open space standards and do not provide quality outdoor space for the units. This all in an area of existing open space deficiency as identified in map 7 Open Space of the Core Strategy.

The arrangements for waste collection and bins are not well considered. In fact, the space available for dealing with waste is so small that the developer is proposing a private waste contractor as the solution. This is a result of cramming too many flats into a small site and the issue is unlikely to be resolved at detail stage meaning a poor environment around the scheme is likely to be the end result and a failure to meet Policy CS18 Dealing with Waste.

It also fails to meet criteria set out in the later part of DP26 specifically that developments are to provide: h) an acceptable standard of accommodation in terms of internal arrangements, dwelling and room sizes and amenity space; i) facilities for the storage, recycling and disposal of waste; j) facilities for bicycle storage; and k) outdoor space for private or communal amenity space, wherever practical.
