

Objections to Planning Application Ref 2016/1345/P

I use the playground in Crabtree Fields with my two children.

I am disgusted at the fact that an application of this calibre has been made.

The building proposes to have several windows that are directly facing the children's playground.

I am also amazed how the planning department at Camden has indicated in its conversations with the applicant that it will approve the application ?

This is unbelievable and a tragic set of circumstances for all the children that use this playground.

How about the fact that these flats have wall to wall windows not only on a party wall to the playground Crabtree Fields but face it directly.

Also the bulk of the project is too heavy for the area.

It is a Greenfield site that has amazing vistas and clear space.

The area immediately to the rear of the building is public space. Crabtree Field is in current, active, equipped use as a young children's play area and the proposed fenestration onto this area will not be in line with such usage.

The Design Statement of the applicant claims that the proposed, extensive fenestration would "provide natural surveillance of Crabtree Field". I do not see how this is a justifiable claim as the proposals currently incorporate the provision of opaque glass, which would preclude such surveillance. In addition, the four flats created would not be in a position to make practicable use of the recreational facilities they would surveil due to their lack of direct physical access to same.

The proposal (apart from the proposed alterations to existing roof top dormers on the main building) fails to positively enhance the Conservation Area or the immediate setting of the neighbouring Grade II Listed Building 26 Charlotte Street. Crabtree Place and Crabtree Gardens is a small area where development proposals should be considered very carefully: the intensification of residential use and physical alterations and extension will ruin and overwhelm the character of the area. The protection of the historic qualities of the park is also supported by the Council's conservation policy and guidance that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. Notwithstanding the traditional alterations to the roof works undertaken in the 1970's, the alterations to the rear façade and party wall will have a visual impact which is unacceptably harmful to the strongly traditional character of the area.

This is a public park that is enclosed and no other development has windows on its party wall. House extensions in the Conservation Area are required not to significantly enlarge the overall size of the original house. In such calculations, the cumulative size of successive extensions needs to be recognised in assessing the size of the house as originally built. The issues of density and overdevelopment of the property also need to be considered. The design proposed is ugly in terms of not just overall bulk and massing but also choice of architectural detailing and materials. The proposed design does not fit in with that evident in the rear of the other houses. It is the only house with this large proposed bulk and massing at its rear. The proposal is overbearing, out of scale and

out of character in terms of its appearance compared with the existing development in the immediate vicinity. A higher standard of design is expected in a Conservation Area and the proposal would adversely affect the setting of several historical buildings in the area. Councils are under a legal duty to have particular regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of a Conservation Area. The impact of this development on the landscape of this Conservation Area must be considered carefully. The proposed exterior alterations to the existing unpierced rear party wall would clearly be out of character in a Conservation Area where no other homes have been extended in this fashion. The development currently proposed is aggressive in character. It is only with the excessive alterations to this party wall that the level of accommodation currently proposed could be achieved.

The conversion has a visual impact which is unacceptable in terms of its harm to the character of the Conservation Area and the setting of the next door listed building No 26 Charlotte Street in terms of the adverse impact which the proposed development has on the character of the neighbourhood and on the residential amenity of neighbours. This terrible design creates a large void and windows on our party wall as well as windows on the sides of the development that overlooks Crabtree Place and the playing field. The plan of 4 new flats requires new windows gaining commercial advantage in using the Crabtree Fields party wall. This is a public park that is otherwise enclosed and no other development has such windows on its party wall. House extensions in the Conservation Area must not significantly enlarge the overall size of the house, and the cumulative size of successive extensions needs to be taken into account in this calculation compared to the size of the house as originally built and extended to create the existing low density use, ancillary artist's studio. The issues of density and overdevelopment of the site needs to be considered. The design including bulk and massing, detailing and materials is ugly. The new proposed development does not fit in to the back of the other houses. It is the only house with this large proposed bulk and massing at its rear. The resulting proposal is overbearing, out of scale and out of character in terms of its appearance compared with the existing development in the vicinity. A higher standard of design is expected in a conservation area and it affects the setting of a number of historical buildings in the area. Councils are under a legal duty to have particular regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of a Conservation Area. The impact of this development on the landscape in this Conservation Area has to be considered carefully. Enjoyment of a view (even a private one) within such an area is an important part of the residential amenity of a neighbouring property, and this proposed development will have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of the properties in Crabtree Place

There has been much highlighted above about the nature and close proximity of neighbouring, residential and commercial properties to the application building, in particular the extensive subterranean nature of the open plan office which lies within the whole basement area beneath Crabtree Place. The submitted application presented provide reports on the topic of party wall issues and proposed basement construction but they do not provide the detail necessary in terms of their physical impact upon and physical relationship/proximity to neighbouring property structures and services and the detail of the mitigating/construction works necessary to protect same. The key missing elements of analysis which should be provided for public and formal consideration before any decision is reached by the Local Planning Authority are as follows: (I.) sections through existing, adjacent property, basement level developments, (ii.) actual ground condition / soil sampling and (iii.) 3D plotting of subterranean services. Such detail is essential to demonstrate the actual relationship between existing, adjoining property, basement foundations and service runs whilst showing how the design and construction of the proposed basement and new flank/party wall foundations will protect those structures and services within adjoining property whilst still supporting the elements of the existing application building which the current drawings indicate as being retained. The cautionary notes to be found in the reports presented within the current

application leave too many unanswered questions in relation to the practical ability for the development to be completed in a safe and logical manner without endangering the stability and integrity of neighbouring property or physically encroaching upon same (e.g. by merit of foundation/shoring). Any physical encroachment upon neighbouring private property remains a matter which requires to be resolved solely by agreement under civil law and is not prejudiced by any potential grant of planning permission or regulations provided under the Party Wall Act.

There is a concern regarding the basement and how this will affect the neighbouring properties and the historical foundations. The large buttress which holds up the current building has not been addressed as to how it will be secured.

I object fully to the revised plans of the entire proposal.

Yours sincerely

Jonathan M. Taylor

23/1/2017