

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5071/P	Duncan Macpherson	116 Albert Street London NW1 7NE	06/12/2017 07:41:30	OBJLETT ER	I wish to be notified of the committee date. I have submitted a letter with comments to the officer in charge of the planning application.
2017/5071/P	Simon Foster	137 Albert Street	05/12/2017 16:52:56	OBJ	Dear Sir / Madam We live opposite the ORT building. We are very concerned about the front elevation of the proposed development. This proposal moves the frontage of the building from being sympathetic to the historical context and local residential streetscape to an unsympathetic commercial "shopfront" appearance. Albert Street is in the Camden Town Conservation Area and it is singled out as a "high quality streetscape" in the Camden Town Conservation Area Appraisal and Strategy document. This document further notes that Camden expects "the historic details which are an essential part of the special architectural character of Camden Town Conservation Area to be preserved, repaired and reinstated where appropriate." and goes on to say that "The special character of the Camden Town Conservation Area is vulnerable to erosion and significant harm through neglect and lack of investment, and through inappropriate change. This status was upheld in the case of 27 Parkway (2014/1954/P etc) when the applicant wanted to place a similar glass shopfront on the largely residential Arlington Road which runs parallel to Albert Street. Given this background and recent precedent to protect the mainly residential nature of Albert Street, we would ask that the planning team be minded to refuse the current front elevation in order to maintain the special character of Albert Street. Yours faithfully Simon Foster
2017/5071/P	Elsbeth Harrison	127 Albert Street London NW1 7NB	05/12/2017 10:45:43	COMMNT	I live directly opposite ORT. The proposed "shop window" type ground floor windows - far larger than the existing- will be out of keeping & intrusive. They will break the streetline window facades carefully kept by the present building This is a residential street; apparently small changes can create precedents . The strict planning requirements for our Grade 2 listed houses should be as rigourously applied to other buildings in the street I hope it will be seen that these very large windows planned for the ground floor of ORT would be out of keeping & insensitive to the rest of the street.
2017/5071/P	katy horwood	flat 7 155 arlington road London NW1 7ET	02/12/2017 09:03:12	OBJ	I would like to object to this development as i feel like it would have a detrimental affect on my residential property infant of it, in terms of light and quality of living. I don't feel like this residential area is suitable for more office space and I feel unnerved at the idea of another year of building works after what we have had to endure with the gym development on the opposite side of the road for the last 2 years.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5071/P	Chrysa Kasma	118 Albert str basement flat	05/12/2017 21:52:06	COMMNT	<p>I live next door(118 Albert str) to the proposed works and I am particularly concerned about the proposed overlooking windows and the noise which might be generated from the plant room.</p> <p>In paragraph 2.04 that 'The noise sensitive receptor that will be most affected by noise from the proposed plant is likely to be the rear facade of the closest residential property (118 Albert Street) and its garden.' The re-siting of the plant room in the basement of the property creates a question of significant noise and disturbance.</p> <p>Drawing no. PA 11 shows projected bay windows. It appears that the apertures which look towards the east elevation of the buildings in Albert Street are would overlook us.</p> <p>The application shows insufficient detail e.g. areas of opacity in projected windows. Misleading and inaccurate information on the front elevation e.g. drawings v photographs.</p> <p>It is also unable to be specific about the plant room/duct work which is 'not known at the time of writing the report'.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the application on the grounds of privacy and potential noise.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Chryssa Kasma</p>

2017/5071/P	Caroline Macpherson	116 Albert Street London NW1 7NE	06/12/2017 07:43:33	OBJLETT ER	<p>I wish to e notified of the committee date.</p> <p>I have submitted a letter stating my objections to the planning application.</p>
2017/5071/P	Julia Macmillan	flat 4 155 Arlington Road NW17ET London NW1 7ET	01/12/2017 13:45:30	OBJ	<p>I object to this proposal as I live right in front of it and it will block my light even more than it does already, I will be overlooked and I think it will too much of an office development in a residential area.</p>
2017/5071/P	Duncan Macpherson	116 Albert Street London NW1 7NE	06/12/2017 07:41:14	OBJLETT ER	<p>I wish to be notified of the committee date.</p> <p>I have submitted a letter with comments to the officer in charge of the planning application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5071/P	Dr Alexander Alexiou	Flat 5 155 Arlington Road	04/12/2017 14:44:54	OBJ	<p>I object to the suggested planning application. The proposed access point for machinery and works would be through the vehicular access point on Arlington Road. This had windows and bedrooms of the residential dwellings directly on it. My residence lies just above it.</p> <p>The noise and disturbance from this would be unbearable. If compared to the noise and pollution and disturbance we have been subjected to from the recent works at the Mornington Gym it would be distasteful for local residents. I would mean months if not years of noise, being woken up by machinery. Work men just outside our windows. Dust and pollution would increase. The carpark area of the ORT building is particularly noisy to local residents even when workers are parking cars and talking given the echo and closed environment it is in.</p> <p>It is absurd also that planning permission would be granted for a commercial building in a residential area with the aim to expand its floor space and its area.</p> <p>From my house with the suggested changes to the 3rd floor I would no longer be able to see the sky above the new building unless I was standing within inches of my living room and bedroom windows. It would significantly block direct sunlight. During summer and spring months the sun just about passes over the current building and shines light into our dwelling. Any changes would be catastrophic for this and would make our living room and other rooms much darker.</p> <p>I 100% object to the submitted proposal for building works. The residents of my building (155 Arlington Road) are all in agreement. The elderly lady who lives below me in flat 3 is very upset to hear that there has been such a proposal submitted. She does not have means to submit an online objection.</p> <p>The health implications of work carried out in such close proximity to our residences is also far reaching. The dust and fumes from vehicles, noise pollution all have direct impact on residents physical wellbeing and mental health. (we have experience from the ongoing works on the other side of our building at the old Mornington Sports Hall which have been ongoing for over 2 years.</p> <p>I also do not understand how no written correspondence was submitted to each resident directly affected by this proposal. I only found out 2 days prior to the deadline through word of mouth.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5071/P	Angela Andersen	118 Albert Street NW1 7 NE	04/12/2017 16:47:49	COMMLETTER	<p>I oppose this application because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The windows at the rear 1st floor will be overlooking my property.2. The altered front elevation will be out of scale with the grade 2 terrace house in a conservation area.3. The removal of a noisy plant room to the other side of my wall will be a source of potential noise. <p>I am sending a letter with enclosures relevant to the previous application in 2000 which was refused.</p>
