



Dear Tessa Craig,

Application 2017/507/P
ORT House, 126 ALBERT STREET.

As as the resident of 114 Albert Street I wish to comment on the above proposed alterations.

Firstly I must draw your attention to the fact that Albert Street is listed as a well-preserved example of an early-Victorian street which, with the help of Camden Planners and residents has stayed more or less intact. ORT was built in the seventies but Camden insisted that though modern in design, the windows would echo the rhythm of the existing terrace, thus providing a harmonious continuity. To allow ORT to change to large modern glass panels on the street would make a mockery of all the previous care taken by residents and planners in the past. The existing windows are providing plenty of light and it seems that ORT are just trying to update the building for no practical reason.

However my greater concern is for the proposal at the back of ORT. I am very worried by the relocation and exposure of their ventilation arrangements. These were previously located at high level facing away from us. Our garden is 40 feet from the new venting canyon (previously roofed over) ,by moving and exposing this vent so close to domestic buildings, it would not only be a health hazard but a potential disturbance to a peaceful and purifying enclave of trees. The joint gardens play an important role in combating high air-pollution from nearby Parkway, already a health- hazard. As you will be aware Albert Street is about to receive the full force of HS/2 excavation with Albert St. designated as a holding bay for queuing and resting waste-lorries. Therefore you will agree that yet another threat of heightened noise and pollution has been most alarming. Already, on the other side of Parkway are many restaurants venting noxious fumes into the atmosphere and the pollution readings are high.

At no time has ORT approached us with an explanation of their plans which will obviously impact on our peace and health, they seem to forget that this is a residential street which over the years has been restored from a near derelict slum, fifty years ago, to a jewel in the crown of Victorian Camden. Indeed, so keen were Camden then to restore it as an architectural entity that they gave mortgages and paid for bathrooms as an inducement to restoration, which many of us did with great dedication. More importantly we have no technical details of the potential capacity of the new equipment and whether it will emit more fumes.

Finally I come to the proposed new windows at the rear. At present we are overlooked by only one small one at 2nd floor level. Now they propose four big windows, albeit opaque. I worry that they could easily be changed to transparent glass a little later. Secondly the transparent side-panels will lighten our gardens at night. ORT are in the habit of leaving their lights on.

Angela Andersen at 118, they do admit, will bear the brunt of this work, but ORT should realize that if they go ahead they will affect many people in the houses and garden to the south of them. This is a residential community which should not have to bear the brunt of large-scale industrial pollution and noise which I fear this scheme threatens to do.

Yours sincerely,



Belinda Bruce-Dick

Tim Bruce-Dick MA hons, AAdip, RIBA
114 Albert Street
London NW1 7NE



www.tbdarchitects.co.uk
www.timstoursandwalks.co.uk
www.londonarchitecturecourses.co.uk