

Charlotte Street Association

39 Tottenham Street
London W1T 4RX
email: [REDACTED]

**Regeneration & Planning,
Development Management,**
London Borough of Camden,
Town Hall, Judd Street,
London WC1H 8ND.

31st January 2018

For the attention of Laura Hazelton, Planning Officer.

By email to: planning@camden.gov.uk

Dear Laura Hazelton,

Re: reference 2017/6922/P: Cyclone House, 27-29 Whitfield Street, London W1T 2SE:

Change of Use of Basement, Ground Floor and 1st Floor to flexible Retail, Business and Non-Residential Institutional uses (Classes A1/B1/D1), and 2nd Floor to B1 Office Use (Class B1a), erection of new single-storey roof extension (i.e. new 3rd Floor) to create additional Office space; new rooftop plant enclosure (i.e. at new 4th floor level); facade alterations including new (additional) front entrance, replacement windows, and infill of lightwell at basement level. [New Application]

Our Association wishes to make comments and objections as set out below, concerning the above planning application.

1. The setting of the Listed building:

There is strong objection to the proposed 3rd Floor Extension together with the proposed large 4th Floor Plant Room. The bulk of these two new extensions is seriously detrimental to the setting of the Grade II Listed Building next door at no. 1 Colville Place, when viewed from the long view in Whitfield Street, and from the public open space of Crabtree Fields; and the affect from the 3rd Floor terrace of the Listed Building at 1 Colville Place.

(a) The quality and setting of the Listed Building next door at 1 Colville Place:

Recently, buildings from this period are now being appreciated again (including in many recent publications). The listing describes this house as being immaculately detailed and is a rare example of a modernist infill scheme of sophistication and careful taste. But its setting and the way it is built in context needs also to be fully appreciated - its design not only relies on proportions and materials, but on the way it is "knitted into" the terrace, and does not compete with the terrace.

By contrast, the proposed 3rd and 4th Floor (plant room) extensions, due to their bulk, will overshadow 1 Colville Place and thus be seriously detrimental to its setting.

Despite what the applicant says in their "Design, Access Statement", we do think that the existing façade treatment/existing scale of window openings of 27-29 Whitfield Street building is domestic in scale, more in keeping with the terrace.

(b) The Proposed "Elevation 2" drawing (drwg no. 51517-P-61 Rev H) gives the wrong impression because the front elevation of 1 Colville Place is shown in the same grey

Continued to page 2

tone as the back of the Goodge Street buildings, as though all these buildings are in the same plane. The back of the Goodge Street terrace buildings are set well back (some 16 metres) and not seen in the long view in Whitfield Street. (It should be noted that, on this drawing, the building that is still incorrectly labelled as "21 Whitfield Street seen beyond" is in fact "21 **Goodge** Street seen beyond".)

- (c). A truer impression is given in the elevation drawing (shown in colour) Proposed Colville Place Elevation as shown on page 12 of the Design & Access Statement where the back of the Goodge Street buildings (again incorrectly labelled as 21 Whitfield Street) are shown in white. Thus, this drawing shows the bulk of the proposed 3rd Floor Extension and the 4th Floor Plant Room in comparison with the Listed Building of 1 Colville Place.
- (d). Viability of scheme without the need for the 3rd Floor extension:
Although we have commented in some detail on the design of the proposed extension and the affect on the setting of the Listed Building next door, we also wish to query the need for this Extension in terms of overall viability of the scheme - our impression is that the refurbished scheme is perfectly viable without the need for the Extension.

2. Proposed 4th Floor terrace:

We wish to object to this top floor terrace, for the following reasons:

- (a). This top floor terrace is described as an amenity space, presumably for the 5 floors of office space (B1) together with the A1/D1/B1 flexible uses. A very considerable number of people could use this space, and we reckon could accommodate upto 20 to 30 people. The level of this rooftop terrace is well above the tops of the Colville Place houses and the Goodge Street terrace buildings; and thus the noise of people on this terrace, especially in the evenings and at weekends/public holidays will carry to the nearby residential houses and flats. Colville Place is wholly residential; and all the Goodge Street buildings (except for two of them) have residential flats above Ground Floor, which look out at the rear.
- (b). We particularly think that there could be serious noise nuisance to the nearby residential in both the Colville Place and the Goodge Street buildings, especially when used in evenings and at weekends & bank/public holidays. With the proposed mix of flexible uses, evenings and weekend use of 27 Whitfield Street are likely. Furthermore, we have recent/current experience in Fitzrovia of office use to midnight for 7 days a week (and causing disturbance to the nearby residential flats), reflecting the trend of certain office use 24-hours a day.
Please see our **attached Map Showing Buildings With Residential**.
- (c). Despite the set-backs, we reckon that there will still be overlooking from this terrace onto the 3rd Floor terrace at 1 Colville Place.

3. Proposed roofs at 1st Floor (rear), 2nd Floor (rear) and 3rd Floor (front):

There needs to be a condition that confirms that access to each of these these three roofs is for "maintenance only".

Continued to page 3

3. Proposed roofs at 1st Floor (rear), 2nd Floor (rear) and 3rd Floor (front) - continued:

In the applicant's "Design, Access Statement & Heritage Statement" (page 14 under section 4: Amenity re. Pre-Application Advice), it says that these three roofs/"terraces" "... have been annotated "for maintenance only" as requested ... by the Council ...", but this has not been carried out in all cases on the drawings.

On the proposed plans:

- 1st Floor small rear roof is labelled as "Green Roof";
- 2nd Floor small rear roof: this one is labelled as "Flat roof for Maintenance Only";
- 3rd Floor front roof is labelled as "Green Roof".

4. Proposed Colville Place Elevation:**(a). Ground Floor windows:**

There is objection to the proposal is to extend the existing Ground Floor window openings down to just above floor level, because when used as office use, the clutter of such use will inevitably be seen from the street. Also, the extended forecourt (the paved area with trees and benches alongside Whitfield Street) of the public park/ Crabtree Fields will lose the "privacy" and relative intimacy it currently enjoys, as it is not generally overlooked by such extended ground floor glazing.

(b). Render:

It is regrettable that the existing recessed "lines" will not be re-instated, which gives a subtle and intimate scale to the facade(s).

Conclusions:

1. There is strong objection to proposed 3rd floor extension and 4th floor plant room, because their bulk is seriously detrimental to the setting of the Grade II Listed Building next door at 1 Colville Place.
2. There is objection to 4th Floor terrace as amenity space, because of likely serious noise nuisance especially in evenings and at weekends/public holidays causing disturbance to the nearby residential.
3. There is objection to the proposals for front 3rd floor roof, because it is likely to encourage use as a terrace, instead of access for maintenance only.
4. There is objection to the proposals relating to both existing rear 1st Floor and 2nd Floor roofs, because the proposals (window openings to roof level, and addition of railings) is likely to encourage their use as terraces, instead of access for maintenance only, to the detriment of the residents amenity at 1 Colville Place, especially at 1.8 metre distance from windows.
5. Regarding the proposed Colville Place elevations, there is objection to the lowering of the ground floor window openings.
6. Regarding the renewed render, it is regrettable that the "recessed" lines are not being re-instated, which give a subtle, intimate scale.

Yours sincerely,

Clive Henderson,
Committee Member,
On behalf of Charlotte Street Association.

Enclosed: (1). Our Map Showing Buildings With Residential;

Copy: CSA Committee.