

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6922/P	Deborah Saunt	357 Kennington Lane London SE11 5QT	28/01/2018 21:36:02	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this application which is a re-submission of the previous 2016/6495/P to which I objected. The same concerns (restated below for clarity) remain but are increased by few other new issues relating to The Heritage and Townscape Statement.</p> <p>This planning application adversely effects a beautiful Grade II Listed building from the post-war period in central London. The status of this listed building must be emphasised as it deserves a much-needed enhanced level of protection given the threat a current planning application represents.</p> <p>At no point does The Heritage and Townscape Statement reflect nor respect the full status of the Listed Building and its significance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It fails to mention that its Listed entry is currently under review by Historic England due to this application – a point that the Heritage Statement fails to mention in the application.</li> <li>2. It fails to address the significance accorded to the objections of the Twentieth Century Society - a statutory consultee and expert in matters relating to modern buildings – in relation to the Listed Building and the harm the proposals will have if consented.</li> <li>3. Overall, the author appears not to be impartial in making an objective assessment of the building's significance and therefore any harm is may face. In 1973 when the survey was carried out for the conservation area assessment in which the Listed Building stands the author did not mention 1 Colville Place, even though it was at the time, and is, a work of great maturity. Modern buildings, even when new and unlisted, do routinely get mentioned in conservation area statements if they are of significance, yet the author failed to spot this at the time and seems indisposed towards buildings of this period.</li> <li>4. The author describes the setting of 1 Colville Place as “tightly confined” and uses this as the basis for his rationale that therefore building up an extra storey immediately beside it will not harm its setting negatively, indeed it will enhance it! This is disingenuous as the listed building is anything but confined – indeed the top floor is designed to make the most of its current open setting, given its location in the heart of the city. Here, at the point in the terrace where no neighbours overlook it, a terrace was designed for the amenity of the residents indeed but was most importantly composes as part of the elevation architecturally, with the top floor accommodation carefully set back out of view, to maintain the consistent roof line. He also says the impact is one that cannot be appreciated unless viewed obliquely, which is factually incorrect. The submission by Max Neufeld of CGI views of this proposal completely debunk this assertion as the top floor of 27/29 Whitfield St will be highly visible when set against the modest roofline of its neighbour, the listed building, thus disrupting its architecture and its setting. And to suggest that this minor street be terminated by a higher building due to the fact that at the other end of Colville Place a taller building exists is not consistent with the urban situation and hierarchy of the end of Colville Place next to Whitfield Street – a minor street in comparison with the grander ambitions of Charlotte St.</li> <li>5. Architecturally this setback also speaks of the modernist principles of making the most of nature and the well-established practice in the 20th century of designing occupied roof terraces with open views outward and above as a key tenant of modernism – and one echoed in other listed urban buildings of this time in the UK. To suggest that an additional</li> </ol>

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

storey immediately next door, oppressively overbearing the architectural grace of the Listed Building's roofline is not creating a harmful impact is intellectually and academically weak in heritage terms. The fact residential amenity is harmed is unfortunate but here the case is an architectural objection. To that end the following statements by the author are contradictions – the asset cannot be praised at the same time as saying the works immediately adjacent do not harm it and to then attempt to justify it by saying it is an enhancement.

5.4 The listed building at No. 1 Colville Place is an interesting example of the post-war infill of an original plot, which was left as a vacant site following war damage. Designed in a minimalist modernist style typical of the 1960s by Max Neufeld in brown brick with concrete beams to the front and rear, it was rightly listed grade II as an immaculately detailed example of a modernist infill scheme of sophistication and careful taste. It warrants care and sensitivity to ensure that any adjacent development does not harm its wider setting. The proposed development at 27-29 Whitfield Street fulfils this requirement. As explained in paragraph 6.6 below, its immediate setting is very tightly confined and the proposals cause no harm to it.

6.7 First, the improvements to the elevations of 27-29 Whitfield Street will significantly enhance the relationship between the two buildings and the conservation area. The use of the ground floor of No.27-29 as a gallery space and the enlargement of its windows provides a much greater congruence with the adjacent listed building not only in terms of their complementary uses, but also their physical inter-relationship. The enlarged windows will complement the similar approach adopted in the original design of the ground floor gallery at No 1. Such a relationship will be far better in terms of the wider setting of No 1 than the current adjacent dead frontage. Second, as indicated in 6.4 above, the adjustments to the window proportions of No.27-29 create a stronger rectangular proportion, particularly at ground level, which on the Colville Place frontage echoes the window proportion used at first floor level of the listed building thereby conferring better integration between what at present are two very disparate buildings. Finally, at roof level the new roof extension aligns precisely with the roof storey of the listed building. The only impact on the setting of the listed building would be in an oblique view from Crab Tree Fields, and from the west side of the footway in Whitfield Street. Even in winter, both views are screened heavily by tree cover. After careful consideration, I do not believe that the proposals would cause any harm to the significance, special interest, heritage values or setting of No. 1 Colville Place, or to any of the inherent qualities which warranted its addition to the statutory list.

6.10 In paragraph 2.13 of the officer's report, it suggests that there is 'potentially modest impact to the setting of the listed building, in terms of the height of the third floor and it resulting in a very slight increased sense of enclosure to the front terrace users of No. 1 Colville Place.' This is also flawed reasoning. A very slight increased sense of enclosure for the users of the adjacent terrace is a matter of residential amenity and not a matter which affects any aspect of the significance of the building as a listed building, the qualities for which it was listed, its inherent heritage values, or its setting. Where is the demonstrable harm to the significance of the listed building as a heritage asset?

6.11 The Council is right to attach great weight to the setting of the heritage asset. However, even if the Council contends that in listed building terms, there is some slight harm to the wider setting of the listed building at No. 1 Colville Place in relation to oblique

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

views of the building, (which is difficult to discern), then this is decisively outweighed by the wider public benefits conferred on the setting of the listed building by its better integration with No. 27-29 Whitfield Street through the re-modelling of the façade, the adjustment of its window proportions, its comprehensive facelift, the improved relationship of the ground floor with the street and the animation of the street scene arising from that. In conservation area terms, these constitute a substantial enhancement of No.27-29 Whitfield Street and its contribution to the conservation area. The Council has accepted the benefits to the conservation area and these have not been challenged.  
I hope very much that this application Cyclone House, 27-29 Whitfield Street, London, W1T 2SE is refused.

Previous objections to 2016/6495/P

The proposal is next door to the Grade II Listed terraced house by Max Neufeld at 1 Colville Place, overlooking Crabtree Gardens W1 - a building I have loved for the last 20 years (without knowing the architect at the time) as I wish to defend the best work of this often over-looked or marginalised period architecture. The elevation upon closer study is in proportional conversation with its neighbours from the 18/19th century. It really is a ray of beautiful mid-century modernism in the city, where the essence of Brutalism is evident in the raw materials and integrity of the design which manages to bring just the right amount of commercial street frontage to a quiet public space and pedestrian cut-through by carefully setting the glazing to the gallery shopfront back from the vertical plane of the facade as a deep carved space where the front door also coincides and the basement area is cut away in the ground plane too. The suggested amenity and social inhabitation of the roof terrace with its sense of connection with nature (plus the original greenery here too) is a key component of the composition and one that is seriously threatened by the proposal, as well as the overall height bulk and mass in relation to the building and the terrace as a whole. As the lead designer for Camden's West End Project my practice has sought to recognise the Unsung Heritage of the Tottenham Court Road area and to see them given more status in the rapidly changing area. If we don't save the best, but currently under appreciated, buildings of this part of Fitzrovia it will be too late when their setting is damaged. The proposed extension to this neighbouring building would without doubt be very harmful to the setting of this precious listed building as well as its wonderful streetscape - which is in a conservation area and deserving of proper consideration and respect should any proposal be considered properly. In my eyes it stands as a parallel exemplar to the contextual modernism of The Smithsons at The Economist and marks an awakening of architectural design that, controversially at the time, was divesting itself of the self-referential confidence of early modernism in London and beginning to understand the urban narrative of city-making over time rather than from the perspective of a tabula rasa. I know of no other comparators in the centre of the city.

The Camden application 2016/6495/P concerns a proposed 1.5 storey extension to the existing corner building on Whitfield Street, which looks insensitive and over-scaled, and towers above its neighbour.

Without doubt the proposals are of very poor architectural design quality too. In terms of

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>height, bulk and mass it just looks awfully crude, whilst materially it is cheap and out of keeping with the finer articulation and grain of the architecture nearby. The applicant has done their best in both the elevations and a perspective to obscure the effect of the proposal, and the CGI views supplied in the Design and Access Statement also seem to want to hide relationship of the proposal and the listed building with a tree obscuring 1 Colville Place in a manner that could be construed as misleading. This has necessitated the commissioning of independent CGIs to demonstrate the full scale of impact not only to the neighbouring buildings but to the outlook of the public open space.</p> <p>The proposed additional floor and a half of accommodation and roof terrace will overwhelm the listed modern house and is overbearing and ruins the scale and character of the conservation area focused on this unique urban streetscape.</p> <p>The new outdoor terraces proposed on the corner over looks the private amenity space of 1 Colville Terrace and also allow direct overlooking into the top floor bedroom. Even though the terrace says "for maintenance only" enforcement will be impossible and life made intolerable for the occupant of 1 Colville Place.</p> <p>There is no section that clearly demonstrates that the applicant understands this nor will the officers be able to see the situation that contravenes policy without them.</p> <p>Going up a storey and a half above the terrace roof line here seems wrong in what is one of central London's few remaining modestly-scaled mid-century modern terrace houses which has a unique and well-considered architectural quality very well worth defending.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6922/P	gary sollof	6 colville place london w1t 2bj	28/01/2018 13:17:01	OBJ	<p>I would like to object to this application. I am the owner of 6 Colville Place and issues I have objected to previously, have not been allayed by these revised plans.</p> <p>My concerns are mainly related to the proposed roof extension.</p> <p>The height and bulk of the proposed extension still overwhelms the listed building at 1 Colville Place and could have a harmful impact on it, the conservation area and the park at Crabtree Fields</p> <p>As the proposed roof terrace towers over the 3rd floors of the other properties on Colville Place, this will mean that anyone will be able to overlook from this terrace all along Colville Place. This problem of overlooking will affect my privacy as well as the privacy of my neighbours.</p> <p>In the design and access statement, I notice the CGI photos of the proposed scheme viewed from Whitfield St have been arranged very cleverly, so that the impact of this 4th floor is not shown, as it is hidden behind a tree and also viewed close up so the roof extension can be seen.</p> <p>However, as far as I can see, it is this extension and the roof terrace that will cause all the problems.</p> <p>If the building was occupied fully there could be 30 or more people there and there is no restriction as to how many can use the terrace at one time or for what hours, so there could be 30 people on this terrace for work drinks or a party at any time during the day or night. That would generate a lot of noise and disturbance.</p> <p>I hope this application is rejected.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6922/P	Andrew Smith	38c Goodge Street	29/01/2018 21:46:40	OBJ	<p>We have lived in Goodge Street for 18 years and have a strong interest in the quality of architectural development in the neighbourhood and social amenity.</p> <p>We wish to object to the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The creation of an additional fourth floor will be visible from the public garden area of Crabtree Fields and create a block on the top of the building at the end of the Colville Place terrace visually linking the height of the proposed offices to the east side of Whitfield Street that is a wholly different set of buildings to the Georgian Terrace. Furthermore, this additional floor then creates another floor for the plant room to the level of the top of No.19 Whitfield Street/ back of Goodge Street. Both these additional floors will be clearly visible from the gardens.</li> <li>2. The proposal has the creation of two roof terraces that overlook the park and directly look down on No.1 Colville Place. The third floor terrace has windows in the drawings that are clearly doors and the users of the offices will open these and walk out.</li> <li>3. The terrace at the fourth floor is marked for amenity use and therefore will be used potentially by all users of every floor of the building, depending on what 'flexible use' is approved. In any case this is a large roof terrace, not residential balcony that will dwarf the neighbouring properties particularly No.1 and overlook the terrace area of Crabtree and the main lawn area. In effect people using the grass area will be looked down on by potential users.</li> </ol> <p>The problems with office roof top open spaces is that they are recreational for all hours. To contextualise this, we live near the corner of Charlotte Street and Goodge Street where the office has a roof light (not doors) which on sunny evenings is used to escape at 5.30pm for informal drinks. There are very noticeable voices and laughter when this occurs.</p> <p>Design: the plans include extensive glazing at ground floor level. These large windows do not relate to the surrounding buildings and detract from the privacy of the benches on the public terrace and are inappropriate shop scale windows for this location.</p> <p>The planning application has negative impact on the social amenity of the public park, negative and near intolerable overlook on neighbours and represents overdevelopment on this small site.</p> <p>Additional Comment:</p> <p>The plant will require noise reduction panels/screens, not just reduced noise equipment to screen the plant noise fully from neighbouring properties. This is an ongoing problem with new ventilation system design and noise creep.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6922/P	Linus Rees	Fitzrovia Neighbourhood Association 39 Tottenham Street London W1T 4RX	27/01/2018 20:44:24	OBJ	<p>2017/6080/P Cyclone House 27 - 29 Whitfield Street London W1T 2SE</p> <p>Our association objects strongly to this application because of its negative impact on a listed building, conservation area, public open space, and residential amenity.</p> <p>The development site is on the corner of Colville Place, one of the most characterful and well-know streets in the Charlotte Street conservation area. Colville Place is a unique and very attractive 18C residential walkway containing listed buildings and other buildings of merit. It is one of the most visited and photographed streets in the neighbourhood.</p> <p>The application site adjoins a Grade II listed building which is described as “an immaculately detailed, minimal house, a rare example of a modernist infill scheme of sophistication and careful taste”. This graceful modernist building is often visited on guided architectural walks and its design is highly regarded.</p> <p>The site is also neighbours Crabtree Fields an important and rare public open space. These public gardens are highly regarded for their natural environment, design of landscape, and as a place to sit and relax away from the hustle and bustle of neighbouring streets.</p> <p>The development proposes an extension above roof level which because of its height and bulk will cause serious harm to the setting of the Grade II listed building at 1 Colville Place. The impact is not outweighed by any public benefit proposed by the development.</p> <p>The existing building at the application site, although not a positive contributor, is a modest structure typical of a number of buildings erected after bomb damage in the neighbourhood.</p> <p>We are further concerned that the redevelopment will introduce a negative impact on neighbouring residential buildings in Colville Place and at the rear of Goodge Street.</p> <p>Any use of roof space as amenity space for users of the application site would also cause concern with regard to noise nuisance and privacy. As this is a commercial premises there could be intensive use of the roofspace.</p> <p>In conclusion the development offers no public benefit to outweigh the negative impact it will have on the listed building, conservation area, public open space and residential amenity. For these reasons we recommend that the application be refused.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6922/P	Janet Gauld	Friends of Fitzrovia Parks Fitzrovia Neighbourhood Centre 39 Tottenham Street London W1T4RX	27/01/2018 17:21:42	OBJ	<p>Our group has in one form or another been in existence since Crabtree Fields was created some 32 years ago. Some of those who so successfully campaigned to secure this space remain members of the Friends' group.</p> <p>Throughout this time part of its mission has been to defend the qualities and amenities of this space. In 2006 we supported a successful legal challenge to prevent overdevelopment of the former sub station on the southern boundary, a scheme recommended at the time by Officers.</p> <p>This history is recounted because of its parallel with the present case.</p> <p>Again the qualities of this important public open space are threatened by the proposed additional floors whose overbearing bulk would seriously damage the feeling of openness and outlook from the Park. It would also be damaging to the views of the listed building at 1 Colville Place.</p> <p>The proposed large windows to the ground floor would be damaging to the Park of which the forecourt forms a part.</p> <p>This corner at the junction with Colville Place has a special intimate quality and is a popular gathering place. The proposed oversize windows would turn it into a goldfish bowl.</p> <p>The importance of protecting the positive qualities of Crabtree Fields is reinforced by the immense intensification of use of the space as a result of the failure to provide additional POS to match the demand generated by the large increase in office floor space.</p> <p>For the reasons above the proposed scheme would immensely damaging to the quality of the Park and it's amenity, it offers no public benefit, and should be refused.</p>