

From: Stephan Max Neufeld [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 December 2017 17:07
To: Hazelton, Laura <Laura.Hazelton@camden.gov.uk>
Subject: Ref 2017/6080/P. 27/29 Whitfield Street

Dear Laura

As the owner occupier and architect of the listed house at 1 Colville place where I have lived since 1964 I Wish to object to the proposed additional storeys at the above.

The proposed additions would due to their height and bulk be seriously damaging to the setting of the listed building ,the quality of the conservation area and the amenity of nearby residents The additional storeys would rise almost 4m above my house and 6.5m above my terrace whiCh would be directly overlooked.

Back ground

Application for additional storeys at 27/29 was first made in 2013 this was in March 2015 the subject of a serious breach of protocol when although referred by MemebbersPanel to Cttee for determination was spirited away by Officers and disgracefully not referred to Cttee .

A fresh application made in2016 was approved by committee in July 2017 this was subsequently quashed following a legal challenge conceded by the Council on the grounds,inter alia that the officer's approach to the assessment of the damage to the setting of listed the building at 1CP was fundamentally flawed and consequently the Officer's Report had misdirected Members.

Current Application

The reality is that the difference in existing levels between 27/29&1CP means that any additional storey will inevitably dominate the setting of the listed house and compromise important views from Whitfield St South, the park and the terrace of 1CP.

It's against this background that comments on the current application are made

Of all the applications this is the most damaging and insensitive to date.

It seeks to give an unwarranted prominence to the existing building which is seriously damaging to the conservation area and to the setting of the adjacent listed house. which it would dominate, indeed subsume The height and mass of the proposed extensions shows no respect for the character and scale of the rest of the terrace The proposals are also damaging to important street views of the listed building from Whitfield St. And the park.

There would be serious loss of amenity in terms of overlooking,privacy and noise nuisance.

Heritage Assets

National policy

Sect 66(LB& CA)act 1990

LAshall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or it's setting NPPF 132

When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset,great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.As heritage assets are irreplaceable,any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.

None has been offered.

To allow these damaging roof extensions would conflict with this unambiguous guidance

Design

1.0 The proposed design design of the 3rd floor gives the building an vertical emphasis

alien to it's context and the conservation area 2.0The proposed lime wash finish is totally alien to it's surroundings and would give the building a prominence damaging to the character of the

conservation area and an assertiveness which would detract from the adjoining listed building 3.0The

existing bands of rendering frame the building, give character to an otherwise undistinguished building and provide a legible separation from the adjoining listed building and should be kept.

4.0 Colville Place Elevation

Ground Floor The proposal to substantially enlarge the size of the windows at this level is damaging not only to the setting of the listed building but to the terrace as a whole. It disregards the traditional hierarchy of window sizes thereby detrimentally changing the balance between solid and void. The harmful impact of this would be readily understood had the Applicants met the requirement to provide a contextual drawing. It would be damaging to the scale and special character of this corner of the conservation area

3rd floor. The design of the 3rd floor elevation with its narrowly divided panels of glazing and 0.5m separation from its listed neighbour make it aggressively prominent. When viewed against the sky it would look like a large black box totally overpowering its listed neighbour.

The fully glazed facade would due to the difference in levels overlook the terrace of 1 Colville Place with resulting loss of privacy. An earlier proposal with Juliet balconies effectively and intentionally made the casual and unauthorised use of the roof more difficult. Inward opening windows allowed window cleaning to be performed from the inside. The proposed arrangements do the opposite. No details are provided of the proposed internal barrier however it is clear that regular and frequent access will be required for window cleaning.

5.0 Whitfield Street Elevation

The proposed design gives the building an inappropriate vertical quality totally alien to its context and consequently harmful to the conservation area

6.0 4th Floor terrace

The proposal envisages the use of this terrace by the users of this building. The terrace may be small but it could accommodate up to 20 people at any one time, with a consequential dramatic impact on the residential amenity of the many living nearby (my bedroom window is only 2.0m away). The domestic scale and intensity of use of the immediate surroundings make the proposed amenity use of this space totally inappropriate and unacceptable.

7.0 Disability Access Since the proposed new entrance provides access to possible A1&D1 activities disability access should be provided

8.0 Conclusion

The proposal is wholly without merit and for the foregoing reasons should be refused.

Max Neufeld