

Jonathan Callery
Flat 2
19 Saint Cross Street
London
EC1N 8UN

16.5.2016

Camden Council Planning Department

Dear Ms. Hazelton.

I am the owner-occupier of Flat 2, 19 Saint Cross Street.
I wish to object to the planning application ref: **2016/0873/P** on the following grounds.

The Description of the Development is Incorrect.

The description as outlined in the applicants Design Access Statement is both incorrect and disingenuous. The applicant states that:

The existing building is within a conservation area and is used as a commercial unit. The existing owners are currently refurbishing the unit and the existing roof lights have been replaced.

The proposed Velux windows have been replaced like for like and no additional roof lights have been created.

The building is not a commercial unit it is part commercial and part residential. The commercial part of the building, of which the applicant is a leaseholder, is on the ground and basement floors. The rest of the building is residential and makes up more than 50% of the building, as it has done since 1999.

The applicants own photographs show that the old skylights were not Velux windows but were lean to Georgian wired glass panels. They have removed the glass panels and replaced them with an entirely new roof with 5 Velux windows set into it.

Attachments 1 – 4 are photographs that show how the old roof and my downstairs windows looked before the development. The old lean to windows had been covered over with a felt roof. It had no windows in it. This felt roof has been there since before 1999 when I moved in.

I have also attached a plan of the building (Attachment 5) that was drawn when the building was converted from workshops to residential use. Unlike the applicants Pre-existing plan, it does not show any Velux windows on the first floor. In fact it does not show any skylights at all in the first floor roof.

Also attached (7) are some interior photographs taken by a surveyor of the area underneath the position of the old lean to windows. They show a wall-to-wall false ceiling, damaged by water, no skylights.

I have lived in my flat for more than 17 years it is only in the past few years that I have become aware that there ever was a glazed lean to window beneath the felt. This is therefore a new construction, not a like for like replacement.

Effect on Residential Amenity

Attachments 7 and 8 show the new development and the proximity of the new Velux rooflights to our bedroom windows (the plastic covers are temporary). This constitutes a severe effect on our residential amenity. The potential for noise disturbance is quite evident and as illustrated in Attachment 9, taken from inside our bedroom, light pollution is clearly proven.

Furthermore some vents have been introduced directly outside our windows. Attachment 10 shows them from outside Attachment 11 and 12 from inside. These have not been included in the application and we are concerned as to what kind of smell or noxious fumes they may emit.

I would suggest the above points prove this development is in breach of Camden Planning Guidance CPG6 section 4 and 5.

Other Points

Whilst not a planning issue it should be noted we will also be contacting Camden Building Control to ask for evidence of compliance with building regulations. The applicants own photographs seem to show that the existing glazing was not only covered with felt, but was above a false ceiling that no doubt satisfied part B of the building regulations with regards to fire separation. Previously the ground floor unit was a show room. We now have a situation where our windows are less than half a metre from the windows of a jewellery workshop where hot works will routinely be undertaken. Only recently Just Castings had a fire in their neighbouring unit. This is clearly not a compliant situation.

Hatton Garden is a mixed area where residents and tradition jewellery businesses live side by side. We want to be good neighbours and have no wish to negatively affect the operations of the ground floor business. It has functioned well in the jewellery trade for as long as we have lived here without skylights, and so I do not expect skylights are a fundamental requirement of the operation.

We were not consulted before the work to the skylights was carried out which is contrary to current planning practices, encouraging dialogue between neighbours. The applicants seem to be trying to argue that there is no planning issue here just a like for like replacement. I hope the information submitted by me, and the photographs submitted by the applicant prove that a new

development has occurred, and that that development is in breach of planning policy.

Kind Regards

Jonathan Callery
Flat 2, 19 Saint Cross Street.





















