

From: Stephan Max Neufeld [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 October 2017 12:18
To: Planning
Subject: 27/29 Whitfield Street Ref 2017/4624/P

Dear Laura Hazelton

Strongest objection to the above application on the following grounds :

- 1.0 To describe the complete redesign of the building envelope as a variation of condition is grossly misleading. It is a matter of concern that it was validated.
- 2.0 All the proposed changes make the scheme even more damaging to the character of the conservation area and the setting of the listed building than that approved
- 3.0 The bands of rendering frame the building and give character to an otherwise undistinguished building and provide a legible and important separation from the adjoining listed building and should be kept.
- 4.0 the proposed design of the 3rd floor Whitfield St. Elevation give the building an inappropriate vertical character alien to it's context
- 5.0 It is hard to imagine anything less appropriate than the proposed limewash finish. It is totally alien to it's surroundings ,and gives the building a prominence damaging to the character of the conservation and an assertiveness which would detract from the adjoining listed building and be damaging to it's setting. The CGI submitted is misleading, a limewash finish would be significantly lighter ,would not retain the brick character shown and the pointing considerably more prominent.
- 6.0 The redesign of the 3rd floor Colville Place elevation with it's narrowly divided panels of glazing and 0.5m separation from it's neighbour would make it materially more prominent than that approved. When seen against the sky it would have appearance of a black box totally overpowering it's listed neighbour.
The proposed fully glazed facade would due to the difference levels, overlook the terrace at 1CP with consequent unacceptable loss of privacy.
- 7.0 the approved arrangement at 3rd floor with the Juliet balconies effectively and intentionally made the casual and unauthorised use of the roof difficult. window cleaning could be carried from the inside. The proposed arrangements do the opposite. no details are provided of the height or design of the proposed internal barrier but in any event regular and frequent access will now be required for window cleaning , a material change from the previous arrangement and one which will make condition 9 unenforceable in practice.
The applicants have from the very beginning made their wish to use this space for amenity purposes., and this proposal revives their ambition.
For reasons given in support of condition 9 it is essential that any design for this elevation retains the external barrier and that windows open inwards to allow window cleaning from the inside
Regards Max Neufeld

Sent from my iPad