
From: Katherine Spalding [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 January 2018 12:10
To: Lester, Robert
Cc: Stuart Spalding
Subject: 2017/6209/P Objection Letter

Swillingham & Spalding Ltd (T/A Suburbia)
74 Rochester Place NW1 9JX
[REDACTED]

Robert Lester
Planning Services
London Borough of Camden

10 Jan 2018

Dear Mr Lester,

Application 2017/6209/P
68-74 Rochester Place
London
NW1 9JX

In reference to the above planning application we would like to register our objection. We are freehold owners and occupiers of the 74 Rochester Place unit located directly beneath the proposed development.

On the 17th December 2017 the developer, Mr Black, emailed us with a development proposal. In response to this we asked if had been submitted for planning. His answer was that it was 'about to go through the consultation process'. We now understand that the application had been submitted on the 6th December. And the consultation period had in fact started on the 13th December. This was entirely misleading and delayed our response. It would also appear to us that the choice of time to submit an application, just ahead of Christmas, was a cynical attempt to reduce the opportunity for valid objections to be raised.

On the 10th January 2018 we contacted your department and spoke to Jennifer Walsh. She asked when we might be able to submit our objection. We said by the 19th January 2017, and Jennifer advised that she would email you and ask that you wait for our response then, before making your decision. As discussed with Jennifer we need this extra time to coordinate a response with the other units directly effected by this proposal.

In the meantime we wish to highlight our initial concerns as below, and we will look to expand on these objections before the 19th January.

The proposed development will have significant negative impact on our business, the fabric of our building and our local environment. The main criteria for our objections are:

Impact on light

The increase in height to the front of the building of 3.5 metres (a 61% increase) will unquestionably affect the levels of light we receive in the main studio area of our office. We are a creative business, producing visual

materials. Light is vital to what we do. Any development that reduces light levels at all, will impact negatively on the quality of our working environment and our ability to operate our business successfully.

We would like to request that the site survey by your department includes visiting the inside of the studios to better understand the impact that the overshadowing is likely to have on our business.

We note that the light studies in the proposal document are not accurate. Shadows appear inconsistent when comparing views. We request an independent light study is conducted at the developer's expense before planning permission is considered.

Structural Impact on the building

There is nothing in the proposal to suggest that the building structure could withstand another floor being built on it. We request that a full independent structural survey is conducted at the developer's expense before planning permission is considered.

We will come back with further, more detailed comment on the plans. We have noticed inaccuracies on the proposed drawings for the internal of the building. In particular we have concerns that one of the proposed staircases is to be widened at ground level. If this is the case it would be building on our land without permission.

Visual appearance and impact on local environment

The application describes the development as a 'roof extension' and 'replacement roof'. This proposal is not a roof extension. It is the addition of an extra storey and roof. Where similar applications have been made on this street, a condition of setting back the extra storey by 2.5m has been a requirement.

The proposal does not include a 2.5m set back. The narrow nature of the site would make it impossible to do this. Granting permission to this proposal would be setting a precedent that could lead to further developments that also damage the visual fabric of the street.

The addition of a 2nd storey would have a negative effect to the roofline of the street as viewed in both directions. It would be disproportionately dominant. The random nature of the proposed roofline is entirely not in keeping with the existing rooflines of the units below, and the neighbouring buildings on the rest of the street. The roofline of the street will be grossly changed.

Contrary to the assertions in the proposal, the random roofline would not reduce the impact of the development, but would in fact make its impact worse.

It will have a visually negative impact on the existing look of the street and the conservation area in which it sits.

The plans also shows that the height of the proposed new 2nd storey is significantly greater than the existing 1st storey room height. This is disproportionate.

The materials proposed are not sympathetic to the existing building at ground level or neighbouring properties.

The proposal makes no mention of what impact the addition of a new office space will have on parking and traffic demands on the mews and surrounding streets.

Disproportionate disruption to our business

No consideration has been given to the disruption such a build would have to our business (and other units). It would not be possible to work through the noise, pollution and disruption of the build. Our business would be harmed considerably if it was to go ahead.

We strongly object to the proposal and ask that it be rejected.

We would like to thank you for your patience in awaiting our response in full. We will be in touch in due course.

Yours sincerely

Stuart Spalding
Owner and Director of
Swillingham & Spalding Ltd (T/A Suburbia)
74 Rochester Place NW1 9JX
[REDACTED]