

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5071/P	Mima Garland	155 Arlington Road	07/12/2017 13:03:45	OBJ	<p>I am the owner/occupier of a flat at 155 Arlington Road, Camden and have examined the somewhat complex development proposals for Ort House.</p> <p>In relation to 155 Arlington Road, I note from the submitted Design and Access Statement that the Council's officers submitted detailed comments at the Pre-App Stage. I support the comment contained in their written response as quoted in para. 6.20; "It is noted that the northern (sic) elevation will feature an extended flank wall which is particularly close to the rear of properties along Arlington Road. It is considered that this could have daylight and sunlight implications"</p> <p>The applicant's architect gives a brief comment to this; "This is the north-east elevation. The impact on daylight to the neighbours is therefore limited to late evening sun." Daylight and sunlight are normally regarded as being separate; to use one as justifying the amount for the other is inappropriate.</p> <p>The Daylight and Sunlight Report contains considerable detail; the Executive summary posits; "This scheme is therefore compliant with the BRE Guidelines for daylight and sunlight with the proposal in place." This is questionable. As the Report notes in the Introduction (2.1, para. 2), "The BRE Guidelines specify that daylight and sunlight results be considered flexibly and in the context of the site." The rear windows to 155 Arlington Road are already overshadowed to a degree which I doubt would be acceptable for a new development. Further shading/shadowing is created by the neighbouring projection to the south and the lower ground floor windows sit lower than the ground level of Ort House. The existing effect at the rear of 155 Arlington Road is of being surrounded by nearby tall buildings giving something of a "well like" feel, especially to the lower floors. To further degrade what is only marginally acceptable at present by adding to the height to that part of Ort House nearest to the already overshadowed residential property at Arlington road is unjustified and unnecessary.</p> <p>The sitting room window of my property directly overlooks ORT House and is therefore adversely affected by the proposed changes. The windows of my neighbours on lower floors of 155 Arlington road are adversely impacted by the changes to an even greater degree.</p> <p>I register my support for the officers' opinion in their Pre-App Response that the proposal could have daylight and sunlight implications; it does. I therefore object to the proposal in its current form with regard to the increase in its size, mass and scale.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5071/P	Alex Benasuli	92 Albert St	06/12/2017 12:38:05	OBJ	<p>I am a resident at 92 Albert St and object strongly to this proposed planning application as it is not in harmony with this grade 2 listed street of terrace houses that lies within the Camden Town Conservation Area.</p> <p>I object to the proposed street front elevation which incorporates much more glass and is more suitable to a commercial store fronts while the street is a residential one. The plans are misleading.</p> <p>Proposed windows to the south elevation offend the private of s number of my neighbors and similar plans for this elevation have been rejected in the past and should be rejected again.</p> <p>The proposed plant room does not take into account sensitivity to the neighboring properties in terms of noise, vibration.</p> <p>The planning process for residential houses on this street is extremely rigourous. I expect the same standards to be upheld with regards to this proposed application.</p> <p>Kind regards, Alex</p>

2017/5071/P	Edward Burd	100 Albert Street NW1 7NE	06/12/2017 12:04:26	COMNOT	<p>As a long term resident of Albert Street and having previously objected to applications from ORT which have been upheld, I would like to object most strongly to their proposals on the following grounds.</p> <p>The application appears to have substantial errors and is incomplete.</p> <p>The proposals for the existing front elevation destroys the current sensitive pattern of bricks to windows - solid to void. It is inappropriate for a residential street of Victorian terraces .</p> <p>The proposed windows on the south elevation (not clearly depicted) will affect the privacy of houses adjoining.</p> <p>The noise and vibrations from the new plant room will affect adjoining houses.</p>
-------------	-------------	------------------------------	---------------------	--------	---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5071/P	Caroline Macpherson	116 Albert Street London NW1 7NE	06/12/2017 13:23:06	OBJ	RE: Planning Application 2017/5071/P Site Address: Ort House Conference Centre 126 Albert Street London NW1 7NE

Ms. Craig,

We live one house away from ORT House who has submitted the above application. This letter sets out our objections and reasons. In brief, our concerns regard:

1. the absence of the Proposed Elevation for the South side of the building;
2. the proposed windows on the first floor south-facing wall;
 - our privacy;
 - the negative environmental impact of south-facing windows;
3. the disturbance caused by the proposed site of the new Plant Room;
 - the nuisance of noise;
 - the nuisance of vibrations;
4. the proposed windows on the ground floor façade;
5. the requested access;
6. the classification of ORT House for planning purposes.

1. The absence of Proposed Elevation, south-facing side

1.1 The papers do not include a proposal for the Elevation of the southern side of the building despite it being clearly the side where the most changes are proposed.

1.2 Whether by design or by mistake, it is unacceptable to submit a planning application without the most important information.

2. The First Floor windows, south-facing wall

2.1 We oppose the four bay windows with obscure glazing on the south-facing wall (see PA11 – Pr. FF). The windows are large, extremely close, and would directly overlook us.

2.2 It is not stated on the proposed plan whether the bay windows open or not. There is no point having windows with occluded glass if they can open; any attempt to preserve privacy would be negated.

2.3 It is not clear whether the occluded glass is on all three panes of each window. People would easily be able to look out through the side openings.

2.4 Even if it is occluded glass, there is no assurance that ORT House will not change the glass later on.

2.5 In 2000, a similar planning application to install windows in the same wall was opposed by a large number of residents who would have been overlooked. The application was refused by the Planning Committee on the grounds that it would be too intrusive.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>2.6 When it was first built in 1975, the building was designed not to overlook the private property of the residents, which is why the small windows on the ground floor are above head height. The building was intended to be primarily a conference centre, and remains so today. Ort House Conference Centre remains an office building with the capacity to house a large number of people during the working day. This means a lot of people have the potential of looking down over private gardens.</p> <p>2.7 An additional concern regards the impact of these windows on the energy and sustainability goals. Paragraph 5.9 of the Energy and Sustainability Statement reminds us that “Major development proposals should reduce potential overheating and reliance on air conditioning systems and demonstrate this in accordance with the following cooling hierarchy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Minimise internal heat generation through energy efficient design 2. Reduce the amount of heat entering a building in the summer through orientation, shading, albedo, fenestration, insulation and green roofs and walls” [...] <p>2.8 Crucially, the proposed bay windows, which are all south-facing, have not been included in the Energy and Sustainability Statement. Such an omission is unacceptable because the increased heat they will let into the building in the summer, thereby increasing the requirement for air conditioning and energy use.</p> <p>2.9 On page 23 of the Energy and Sustainability Statement, ORT House make a non-related statement that ORT House intend to use “shading techniques (such as blinds or solar glazing) integrated across the elevations where possible” to address point 2 of the cooling hierarchy. It is worth noting that the inclusion of blinds does not mean that the people in the offices will use them.</p> <p>2.10 We propose that instead of south-facing bay windows, ORT House should use skylights with solar glazing on the flat roof above. This solution provides the building with the light they seek, whilst ensuring the continued protection of neighbour privacy and of the environment.</p> <p>3. The Plant Room disturbances: noise level and vibrational sounds</p> <p>3.1 The stated noise level in relation to the proposed Plant Room at paragraph 4.05 of the Background Noise Survey Report is simply wrong. Position 1 is completely the wrong place to measure the noise level. The noise measured at Position 1 is not representative of the noise climate at the actual location for the proposed Plant Room.</p> <p>3.2 To obtain an accurate measurement of the current noise climate at the specified location, ORT House must measure from the rear of the neighbour’s house, 118 Albert Street, outside the closest residential façade and in the closest garden. This is because the gardens are, apart from birdsong, almost always completely silent.</p> <p>3.3 Furthermore, the type of sound that emanates from a plant room is qualitatively</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>different from the sound of distant traffic, as it has a low timbre, vibrational sound, which is known to have a significant effect on the quality of life. This type of noise carries a very long way, just as one can hear the Tube from a distance in the basement of London houses.</p> <p>3.4 In addition, paragraph 2.03 states “the plant Room is likely to be ventilated via louvers/ducts terminating into a newly formed light well along the southern boundary of the building, separated from the adjoining residential property with a boundary wall.” It is clear that the light well will act as a sound box, thereby amplifying the noise.</p> <p>3.5 The planning does not give reasons why the Plant Room could not be situated on the other side of the building, in the North-West corner of the basement.</p> <p>4. The Ground Floor windows, façade</p> <p>4.1 We oppose the expansion of the windows on the Ground Floor façade (see PA 1- - Pr. GF; PA 14 – Pr. elevation).</p> <p>4.2 If you observe the existing elevation on PA 14 – Pr. elevation, the current building has been clearly designed to comply with the historical style of the street and the conservation area which is composed of grade-2 listed terraced dwellings. To increase the size of the windows would break the symmetry of this style and negate the purpose of a conservation area.</p> <p>4.3 The Design and Access Statement is misleading when addressing the increase of the windows, whether by design or by mistake. In the drawing of the Existing Elevation on page 20, the windows are made to appear full length, extending to the ground. This is not the case. The windows in fact mirror the historical context of the street and of the terraced houses next door (see the photograph on page 10 of the Design and Access Statement).</p> <p>5. Requested access</p> <p>5.1 The proposed access is unacceptable. On page 20 of the Construction Management Plan, ORT House seek access 5 days per week, 8am – 6pm, and the Saturdays 8am - 1pm mornings. The answer appears to be that Saturdays are “by arrangement only”.</p> <p>5.2 We object to all works on Saturdays. Firstly, the requirement for arrangement is far too vague – one wonders by arrangement with whom? We would like clear-cut working hours and to avoid any argument over Saturday access. Secondly, this is a residential area and the proposed works will take place over the summer. We have small children who will be in the garden all the time during the holidays and on weekends during term times.</p> <p>6. Classification of ORT House for planning purposes</p> <p>6.1 To conclude, we would like to raise the point regarding the classification of ORT House. It appears that ORT House is an educational charity, which means it may have planning</p>

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

under Class D1. It is not clear whether ORT House has applied for a change of usage under Class B1 for General office space. We would be grateful if you could look into this issue and inform us of your findings.

We hope this letter sets our concerns out clearly and that you find the suggested alternatives reasonable. Please do not hesitate to contact us at the above address or by email or telephone (below) if you have any questions regarding our statement.

Finally, we wish to speak at the hearing of the planning application, and would be very grateful if you could inform us of the date and time it is scheduled.

Yours sincerely,

Caroline and Duncan Macpherson

2017/5071/P Mary Burd Chair 100 Albert Street 06/12/2017 11:38:01 COMNOT
 Albert Street North NW1 7NE
 Residents
 Association

You will have received comments from individual residents in the street. This is an objection from ASNRA on behalf of all residents in the street which it represents . We do not support the proposal on three counts.

1. The changes at ground level to the front elevation are unacceptable The existing building (inaccurately represented in the drawings) is designed sensitively to reflect the rhythm and proportions of the nineteenth century adjacent terraces. What is proposed destroys this, creating large areas of glass like a shopping street, completely out of place on a residential street. ((We wonder why the existing elevation is drawn so inaccurately)

2, The insertion of windows on the south elevation, (not visible from the street) severely affects the privacy of the houses and gardens of a number of our members. Over the years there have been proposals to add similar windows, which I am glad to say, have all been turned down. Again the proposals are not in the least clear.

3. the disturbance caused by the proposed site of the new Plant Room; the nuisance of noise and the nuisance of vibrations to properties on either side adjoining the building,

Therefore on these three grounds above we most strongly object to these proposals and request that they be refused by your committee

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5071/P	David & Jane Roberts	133 Albert Street London NW1 7NB	06/12/2017 10:19:15	OBJNOT	<p>Firstly, please note our concern that we were not notified of this application. We live opposite ORT House and will be affected by the works and - more importantly - by the proposed alterations to the Albert Street elevation.</p> <p>We note from the drawings that this includes enlarging the entrance and replacing four small ground floor windows with two large ones. As far as we can see, the documentation does not give the reason for these changes.</p> <p>ORT House is designated for business/office use and we do not understand the rationale for a more commercial frontage which would be detrimental to a residential streetscape within the Camden Town Conservation Area.</p> <p>We therefore hope that Camden Planning will not allow any changes to the Albert Street elevation on the grounds that this would harm the "special character of the Camden Town Conservation Area".</p> <p>David & Jane Roberts 6 December 2017</p>
2017/5071/P	Nicholas Ayre	14 Atlantic House 128 Albert St NW1 7NE	06/12/2017 11:45:34	OBJEMAI L	<p>I am the owner of an east facing third floor flat in Atlantic House, which is adjacent to ORT House. While we welcome the refurbishment of the existing third floor plant room, we are very concerned that our privacy will be severely compromised by the installation of four new windows into the north face of the building.</p> <p>Our living room and both bedrooms will now be overlooked by the proposed new office space.</p> <p>The submitted plans of the proposed north elevation for the third floor are incorrect as they show our building to be lower than the ORT building when in fact they are at the same level.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5071/P	m Jenkins	139 Albert Street camden NW1 7NB	06/12/2017 19:34:58	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir / Madam</p> <p>We live opposite the ORT building.</p> <p>We are unhappy with the proposed front elevation of this development. This proposal moves the frontage of the building from being reasonably sympathetic to the historical context and local residential streetscape to an ugly high street style shop front which is not in keeping at all with the late victorian surroundings.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Given this background and recent precedent to protect the mainly residential nature of Albert Street, we would strongly request that the planning team be minded to refuse the current front elevation in order not to worsen the special character of Albert Street.</p> <p>regards Mark Jenkins</p>

2017/5071/P	Ms Grace Edghill	107 Albert Street	06/12/2017 13:29:59	COMMNT	<p>This proposal changes the front of the building from being sympathetic to the historical context and local streetscape (which is mainly residential) to an unsympathetic, commercial "shopfront" appearance.</p> <p>There are four, new south-facing windows on the first floor of the proposed development that will affect the privacy of residents on the east side of Albert Street. ORT had a similar application turned down in 2014, and this too should be turned down as it represents the creeping change of north Albert Street from residential to commercial.</p>
-------------	------------------	-------------------	---------------------	--------	---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5071/P	Nick Winterton and Philip Boardman	161 Arlington Road NW1 7ET	06/12/2017 09:56:32	OBJ	<p>We first wish to object in the strongest terms to the way this application is being handled. The proposals have a serious and adverse effect on our property and on others in Arlington Road and yet neither we nor our neighbours have received any written information from the council alerting us to the application. We have therefore had limited time to prepare these comments. Have the properties in Albert Street that would also be affected been directly informed? It is also likely that it would affect properties in Parkway but there is no sign in the street there to notify people of the application.</p> <p>The applicants have not consulted their neighbours in any way as the plans were being developed.</p> <p>Our primary objection is to the plans at third floor level - the development of the plant room and the bulky extension of the staircase to the third floor. The plans would have a serious impact on the amount of sunlight, daylight and privacy that we enjoy in our garden and in every floor of our house. We can find no reference to this in the application. The additional bulk would be ugly and intrusive. The enlarged windows on the second floor north elevation would also impact on our privacy both in the house and in the garden.</p> <p>We strongly object to the proposals.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5071/P	Joseph Astley-Cooper	159Arlington Road NW17ET	06/12/2017 17:40:53	COMMNT	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. This end of the backways of the houses in Arlington Road and Albert Street is already massively overdeveloped with listed buildings in this Conservation Area overshadowed by the historical overdevelopment of the ORT site. This must not be allowed to increase as it will further compromise the daylighting, privacy and amenity afforded by these houses. It is important to recognise that these houses face an inhospitable environment to their frontage on Arlington Road and rely of the refuge of the rear areas for amenity.2. The development of the existing third floor plantroom is an overdevelopment and extends the existing footprint at this level, blocking out already compromised daylight. Any alteration to the use of this floor should be maintained within the existing envelope (these proposals do not do that).3. The extension to the staircase at the third floor level will be massively obtrusive and block out daylight and sunlight. The amenity spaces to our house are in the rear and this will severely compromise the amount of light we receive. (the proposed stair is that brick block at the rear on the eats elevation and they are extending it up a floor in the same material... blocking out both sunlight and daylight).4. The enlarged windows on the second floor north elevation will increase overlooking, which is a privacy problem to your garden and rear windows.5. The roof terrace will temp smokers and others (as the second floor balcony already does) and increase overlooking and further loss of privacy.6. The security cameras already intrude and face our house and garden and are a privacy issue. They should be removed or redirected. They have no warning signage on them.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5071/P	DAVID JENKIN	157 ARLINGTON ROAD	06/12/2017 19:08:07	OBJ	<p>OBJECTIONS to proposed extensions and alterations to the ORT premises. David Jenkin, 157 Arlington Road NW1 06-12-2017</p> <p>1. Consultation and notification We have not been notified at all at any stage about this application which has apparently been going on for some time. We have therefore not had any consultation. If we had we would have commented on the major impact the proposals have on our property and amenity which are not acceptable. We are good neighbours and would willingly have entered a conversation about the development, but we have been ignored. Our house directly connects to the site and is significantly affected by the existing buildings/ light/ overlooking/ security cameras. And this will make it significantly worse. We therefore OBJECT to the proposals as they are submitted.</p> <p>2. Camden's own policy The Camden Policy DP26 'Managing the Impact of Development on Occupiers and Neighbours' applies and the proposals to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bring the plant room at roof level in to use as office space; - Enlarge the current usable floor area at roof level so that is closer to the edge of the roof; and - Extending the stair core upward by one storey to cater for the new office space <p>All contravene the policy by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reducing privacy in the rear garden and to habitable spaces to the rear of my house through creating more opportunities for overlooking from both new windows and the balconies/ terraces. - Worsens overshadowing by the existing building and staircore in particular, which is exaggerated by the proximity of it to my property; if it is to be incorporated, then it should be accommodated wholly within the existing volume of the ORT building and not outside. - Reduces my outlook to sun, daylight, and open sky; - Reduces sunlight and daylight reaching habitable rooms at ground and lower ground floors. The lower ground floor has not even been mentioned in the daylighting report. The 25 degree rule is already broken by the positioning and height of the existing building and the proposal only worsens this. <p>3. Particular issues</p> <p>The space concerned</p> <p>3.1. This end of the backways of the houses in Arlington Road and Albert Street is already massively overdeveloped with listed buildings in this Conservation Area overshadowed by the historical overdevelopment of the ORT site. This must not be allowed to increase as it will further compromise the daylighting, privacy and amenity afforded by these houses. It is important to recognise that these houses face an inhospitable environment to their frontage</p>

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

on Arlington Road and rely of the refuge of the rear areas for amenity.

The proposed third floor extension

3.2 The development of the existing third floor plantroom is an overdevelopment and extends the existing footprint at this level, blocking out already compromised daylight. Any alteration to the use of this floor should be maintained within the existing envelope (these proposals do not do that). The proposals extend the footprint at this level and it should be restricted to the existing areas on the north and east sides.

The elevations show that the new floor is even higher than the existing plant rooms.

The staircase extension

3.3 The extension to the staircase at the third floor level will be massively obtrusive and block out daylight and sunlight. The amenity spaces to our house are in the rear and this will severely compromise the amount of light we receive. The staircase is heavily treated and must be included within the exiting floor plates so as to avoid any impact on the north and east elevations.

The daylight report

3.4 This is full of errors. In particular it does not reflect the true use of the spaces in 157 Arlington Road. It does not mention the lower ground floor which is a major habitable room, and does not acknowledge the ground floor as habitable rooms.

Overlooking

3.5 The enlarged windows on the second floor north elevation will increase overlooking, which is a privacy problem to our gardens and rear windows. The addition of new windows on the north elevation of the proposed third floor will make this even worse.

Quality of the submitted drawings

3.6 The drawings submitted are of insufficient detail to see clearly what is proposed. The window fenestration on the east elevation is not accurately shown and is misleading. The windows to the existing staircase are wrong. Relative heights of new and old are not shown and hide the raising of the top profile.

Use of the terrace

3.7 The roof terrace will tempt smokers and others (as the second floor balcony already does) and increase overlooking and further loss of privacy.

Security cameras

3.8 The security cameras already intrude and face our house and garden and are a privacy issue. They should be removed or redirected. They have no warning signage on them.

4. Conclusion

As previously stated. We have not been either notified or consulted on this large

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5071/P	Prof. SM Lee and Mrs Monica Lee	135 Albert Street NW1 7NB NW1 7NB NW1 7NB	06/12/2017 14:49:43	OBJ	<p>application. It is the Councils duty to do this.</p> <p>Despite the above, this proposal should be rejected and redesigned to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove the addition to the staircase, relocate any new stair inside the existing envelope, Maintain the existing envelope for any proposed change of use to office space at the third floor level. Further consider the window design to avoid any overlooking. Make balconies and terraces not be available as amenity spaces as their use will be an intrusion into the residential areas at the rear of ORT. Make a requirement for all lights to be turned off at night. Limit the times when motor vehicles can start and run engines in the car park, as this is extremely disturbing at night. <hr/> <p>We live diagonally opposite the ORT building at 135 Albert Street</p> <p>We are extremely concerned about the proposed front elevation of the proposed development. Their proposal changes the frontage of the building from being historical sympathetic to an unfriendly commercial high street "shop-front" appearance which will destroy our gentrified street landscape .</p> <p>Albert Street is in the Camden Town Conservation Area and it is designated as a "high quality historical streetscape" in the Camden Town Conservation Area Appraisal and Strategy document. The document emphasized "the historic details are an essential part of the special architectural character of Camden Town Conservation Area, to be preserved, repaired and reinstated where appropriate."</p> <p>This status was upheld in the precedent 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.</p> <p>Given the historical background and previous precedent to protect this mainly residential designated conservation nature of Albert Street, we urge the planning team to reject the current front elevation and also take the opportunity to improve the special character of our Albert Street landscape. The proposed front elevation needs to be revised to complement the historical architecture style of the surrounding buildings</p> <hr/>
2017/5071/P	Luke Roberts	107 Albert Street	06/12/2017 11:06:05	OBJ	<p>The proposed elevations show new shop front / show room style windows.</p> <p>These are not in keeping with the character of the street.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5071/P	John Neve	111 Albert Street London NW1 7NB NW1 7NB NW1 7NB	06/12/2017 23:46:02	COMMNT	<p>I share the concerns of other Albert Street residents concerning the front elevation of the proposed development. The frontage of the building at present reflects and respects the adjacent terrace of Grade 2 listed houses. The proposed changes to the front elevation would destroy this existing harmony of design and lacks sympathy with the wider streetscape.</p> <p>I object to the proposal on these grounds and ask that the applicant be required to present an improved and more sympathetic proposal.</p>
2017/5071/P	Mary Burd Chair Albert Street North Residents Association	100 Albert Street NW1 7NE	06/12/2017 11:38:17	COMNOT	<p>You will have received comments from individual residents in the street. This is an objection from ASNRA on behalf of all residents in the street which it represents. We do not support the proposal on three counts.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The changes at ground level to the front elevation are unacceptable. The existing building (inaccurately represented in the drawings) is designed sensitively to reflect the rhythm and proportions of the nineteenth century adjacent terraces. What is proposed destroys this, creating large areas of glass like a shopping street, completely out of place on a residential street. ((We wonder why the existing elevation is drawn so inaccurately)) 2. The insertion of windows on the south elevation, (not visible from the street) severely affects the privacy of the houses and gardens of a number of our members. Over the years there have been proposals to add similar windows, which I am glad to say, have all been turned down. Again the proposals are not in the least clear. 3. the disturbance caused by the proposed site of the new Plant Room; the nuisance of noise and the nuisance of vibrations to properties on either side adjoining the building, <p>Therefore on these three grounds above we most strongly object to these proposals and request that they be refused by your committee</p>