

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/2739/P	Chasmors Ltd	Ground Floor 1 Kings Terrace Camden Town London NW1 0JP	16/06/2017 11:10:01	COMMNT	<p>Our location is on the western side of Kings Terrace, ground floor no. 1 and very close to the proposed development. We request Camden Council to refuse this planning application to further extend the height of 48-56 Bayham Place.</p> <p>a. The proposed further increase in height of the building will result in a big reduction in the amount of direct sunlight and general light available to our property at the southern end of Kings Terrace for most months of the year. This cannot be justified.</p> <p>b. We do not wish to carry on our business literally in the shadow of such a visually overbearing development which will completely dominate this cobbled terrace.</p> <p>Camden Council has stepped in many times to limit inappropriate development – time to do so again.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/2739/P	Emma And Thomas Bailey	4 King's Terrace	15/06/2017 10:39:36	OBJNOT	Dear Ms. Carr,

I am writing regarding planning application number 2017/2739/P that has recently been submitted for the site at 48-56 Bayham Place. We are the owners of the property at 4 King's Terrace.

Scale and Mass Within A Conservation Area

We do not consider that the scale and mass of the proposed development is appropriate to, or in sympathy with the surrounding buildings in the Camden Conservation Area. The proposed design would create a building that is fundamentally overbearing in nature and therefore does not positively interact with the mass and height of existing architecture in the area. The additional height would also result in a significant loss of direct sunlight which is already in short supply during the autumn and winter months at the lower end of King's Terrace. This would have a direct impact on the amenity of the local residents. The proposed development is therefore not in keeping with CPG1 points CS14, DP24, DP25 and DP26.

In the supporting documentation I note the applicant attempts to use 8-12 Camden High Street as an example of a building that sets a precedent in terms of height.

This building can not be used as a fair precedent or comparison for the following reasons:

1. Permission was granted for the existing structure at 8-12 Camden High St in 1957 long before the southern end of Camden High St was granted conservation area status in 1997.
2. The building is listed on Camden's own Conservation Area Appraisal as a building that is a 'negative building' that detracts from the appearance of the Conservation Area, and could suitably be redeveloped.
3. The permission for the roof extension in 2003 was granted on appeal, which suggests that Camden were minded to refuse permission for this additional floor.

I note that the site at 48-56 Bayham Place is specifically mentioned on the Appraisal as a building that makes a positive contribution in its current form.

Koko

The proposed design for 48-56 Bayham Place is not in keeping with the extremely high quality and sympathetic design that was recently granted permission for the Koko site. It was very fortunate that the architects for the Koko redevelopment were extremely keen to have the involvement and opinion of the local community and went to great lengths (such as stepping back the building from Bayham Street at the upper storeys) in order to be sympathetic to the surrounding buildings and conservation area. It is regretful that the applicant, architects and planning consultants involved in the applications for 48-56 Bayham Place have not considered or consulted with the local community in a similar fashion.

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

Loss Of Light

With regards to the impact of the proposed scheme on the daylight and sunlight of our property, given the substantial increase in height and mass on the site we are very surprised that the proposal will cause no reduction in our amenity as suggested in the Point2 report.

We would request that an independent surveyor is appointed to review the technical aspects of the analysis, methodology used and the conclusions drawn.

We would also like to see an overshadowing assessment undertaken for the impact of the proposed building on our roof top amenity area, as this has not been undertaken at the current time.

Loss Of Privacy

We note that the additional storey proposed at fourth floor level has windows that would provide a direct view into our kitchen dining area and onto the terrace. There will be a significant loss of privacy as a result. The proposed development is therefore not in keeping with CPG6.

Planning History

Given the nature of the design and the proposed scale and mass of the design submitted under application number 2016/4116/P we remain extremely concerned that the application was determined under delegated powers and did not go to committee. We do not agree with the submitted supporting documentation that suggests that we were consulted by the applicant on their proposed plans and would have attended their open day and commented on the application had we known about it. We are also surprised that Camden did not consider the properties at the southern end of King's Terrace 'neighbours' of the proposed development, given its proximity.

For all of the above reasons we urge you refuse permission for this application.

Yours sincerely,

Tom and Emma Bailey
4 Kings Terrace NW1 0JP

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/2739/P	Alan Morgan	1 Kings Terrace Camden Town London NW1 0JP	15/06/2017 16:33:05	COMMNT	<p>My address is on the western side of Kings Terrace, number 1 and very close to the proposed development site and I request that Camden Council refuse this planning application to further extend 48-56 Bayham Place, for the following reasons.</p> <p>1. The increase in height of the building will have a large negative impact on the amount of light enjoyed in my property at the southern end of Kings Terrace. This cobbled terrace is narrow and the proposed development will affect the amount of sunlight that I receive for most months of the year.</p> <p>Furthermore the building will be visually overbearing and totally out of place with the neighbouring properties, and completely dominate Kings Terrace.</p>
