

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 March 2018 16:30
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Comments on 2016/2457/P have been received by the council.

We cannot, unfortunately, come to the planning meeting next week, however, we want to again strongly object to this proposed building. It will totally destroy our enjoyment of our home due to the light being taken away from rooms and garden.

Yours sincerely
Paula and Bill Armstrong
5 Collard Place

-----Original Message-----

From: planning@camden.gov.uk <planning@camden.gov.uk>
Sent: 12 June 2016 14:37
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Comments on 2016/2457/P have been received by the council.

We strongly oppose these plans for the following reasons:

1. The height of the proposed buildings mean that most of the light to our lounge and second bedroom will be taken away
2. Our garden and conservatory will be without natural light for the best part of the day. With high buildings to both the back and the side to our house it will make the outdoor space and the back of our home very claustrophobic.

We believe that these buildings should not be constructed to the height proposed.

Furthermore, we have been given (verbally) assurance that in any case the following will be adhered to:

- a. There will be no windows overlooking us.
- b. The building at the back of our property would be no closer than 4 metres from the end of our garden.

We would like to be informed of the date that your assessor will inspect the site, and would like them to come to our property and see the effect of the proposed development on our home.

Comments made by Paula and William Armstrong of 5 COLLARD PLACE, Camden Town, London, NW1 8DU Phone [REDACTED] Preferred Method of Contact is Email [REDACTED]

Comment Type is Objection- Letter

[REDACTED]

From: Tom Glanville [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 March 2018 07:32
To: Planning
Cc: Gordon Parker-Whitten
Subject: Re: Comments on 2016/2457/P have been received by the council.

Dear Rob

I note the comment in independant assessment conducted by Aidan Cosgrave dated 7 Feb 18 that for 4 to 6 Collard Place "No assessment has been undertaken of the sunlight to the back gardens and I believe that it would be prudent to ask the applicant to provide this in order to gain a complete picture of the potential effects on amenity to these houses."

If effects of the proposed development on daylight and sunlight to the windows/rooms of 4-6 Collard Place lower back windows is considerable as reported, the effect on the Gardens will be even more severe so how can this not have been assessed and the results taken into account? Or have I missed this in the documentation?

Best regards

Tom

On Tue, Jan 17, 2017 at 8:20 PM, <planning@camden.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Rob

As the owner of 6 Collard Place, I have reviewed the newly submitted material on the Camden website for the proposed development of the Levertons site, and note that the amended plans do not change any of my objections previously submitted to the council.

I cannot see any significant changes to the plans for Site A which will still place a 4 storey building at the end of the gardens of 4-6 Collard Place with all the issues previously stated.

Site B may have been reduced in size from 5 to 4 storeys but the reduction in light, the overbearing sense of enclosure and complete loss of privacy in the Collard Place gardens due to being directly overlooked by all of the windows of the East Elevation remain the same.

The impact on 4-6 Collard Place is shown perfectly in the Revised Section document which shows well designed and conceived three storey town houses with small gardens totally dwarfed by the proposed new buildings. The amenity currently enjoyed by these properties will be destroyed.

The Design and Access Statement, as a marketing tool of the development, paints a positive image of the proposal highlighting residents were generally supportive of the aims of the scheme and indeed one ward councillor being supportive. I am surprised at this as everyone that I have spoken to, while agreeing that Levertons is a valued local business, has been completely against the scale and impact of the proposed development. Two councillors have also written underlining the objections of local residents to this proposal.

In fact, as far as I can see, not one of the neighbouring buildings is in support of this scheme. Does that consensus not suggest that the scheme is not appropriate for the location? While housing is a pressing issue, should the quality of existing homes be sacrificed for developments on a scale that are just too large for the site?

The Statement is also somewhat dismissive of local residents turnout implying that we have not taken the interest to attend consultations or respond to the proposals. Again, I think a review of all of the documented responses show this is not the case and residents are very invested in maintaining the neighbourhood as a decent place to live as it is at the moment. I would suggest that it is the contrary and Levertons are being dismissive of local residents by submitting plans which have not taken local resident objections enough into account.

The Statement is also misleading about the Height of buildings as it shows in 'Section 2.6 Height' that 1-3 and 4-6 Collard Place are 4 storey buildings when they are in fact 3 storey buildings. This has been done to try and establish 4 storeys as the standard height in the 'urban landscape' as referred to several times throughout the Statement but this is incorrect as many buildings adjacent to the development site are 2 or 3 storeys. In addition, none of the other developments that have been completed to 4 or 5 storeys have had such an impact on all the neighbouring buildings as this one would as the density and mass is just becoming too large.

In conclusion, I strongly object to the revised plans in line with my previous written comments as they are not at all in the interests of local residents.

Best regards

Tom

Comments made by Tom Glanville of 6 Collard Place, London NW1 8DU

Phone [REDACTED]

EMail [REDACTED]

Preferred Method of Contact is Email

Comment Type is Comment

--
Tom Glanville

[REDACTED]

4 Collard Place
Camden
London
NW1 8DU

19th March 2018

REF Planning Application No. 2016/2457/P 1-3 and 4, 6 and 8 Ferdinand Place

To The Planning Committee,

Further to our previous objections to the Above Planning Application we wish to still object to this planning application as we feel the previous points raised have not been considered or addressed. We do acknowledge that some items are to be addressed via Section 106 agreements; however we will have little to no say in the outcome of these agreements (i.e. the ventilation opening adjacent to our boundary with noise, smells and vibrations and whether this extract or intake services?). Site A being a proposed four storey building is close to our home and being greater in height combined with the Site B proposed four storey building beside our property will create an overbearing sense of enclosure and claustrophobic effect. This is further enforced by the proposed dark colour (black /blue brickwork of Site A. This proposed colour for this Block on Site A is not in keeping with the brickwork of the original brickwork / finishes of the existing building or any other building within the Ferdinand Place / Collard Place location. This may make the building stand out from all others in the area, but also enforces the enclosure effect upon our property and adjoining properties. If you bear in mind that currently we have a single storey building at the back of our home with the proposed new Site A we will be looking at a dark foreboding wall some 18m long and 16m high instead. Although stepped back at third and fourth storey level is still a formidable and out of proportion wall.

In the planning report it reports that the loss of light due to the proposed Site A and Site B will only be marginally reduced and fall within the guide lines. This however only occurs if maximum flexibility of the guide lines is used in this the case, otherwise the light is significantly reduced, especially out of summertime period

This cannot be correct for the impact from Site A and Site B upon 4, 5, and 6 Collard Place with the proposed new two four storey blocks one to the south and the other to the west of the rear areas of our homes. The figures for effects on 4 Collard Place do not appear to be fully given or explained in the report and therefore some proportional ratios have been made based on the figures given in the report.

We also have concerns with regards to the proposed 4 to 5m deep proposed basement excavation within Site A footprint especially where abutting the rear garden boundary wall as this is the original existing bus garage boundary wall and may be severely undermined by the proposed basement as well as vibration and ground movements in the short effects and long term effects on this wall in due course.

With our previous objections dated 21.06.2016, 18.01,2017 respectively and the points raised in this submission we most strongly objection to this development of the Levertons premises being given planning consent.

Regards,

Gordon and Dianne Parker-Whitten