

## Hazelton, Laura

---

**Subject:** FW: 27/29 Whitfield Street reference 2017/6080/P

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

From: Jim Monahan [REDACTED]  
Sent: 18 April 2018 11:53  
To: Hazelton, Laura [REDACTED]  
Cc: Vincent, Sue (Councillor) [REDACTED]  
Subject: 27/29 Whitfield Street reference 2017/6080/P

Dear Laura Hazelton

I have previously made objections to this scheme though previously it was given a different reference number namely 2017/6922. I suspect that unless I again make representations my previous comments will be completely ignored.

The confusion caused in tracking what application the Council is considering and which scheme revision is now relevant can only be described as bewildering and the Council should not allow such subterfuge, as clearly it is in the applicant's interest to limit comments on their latest revisions that Camden have for some reason lodged as a new application.

Please refer to my previous comments concerning application 2017/6922/FULL as they are relevant to the latest revision.

I object as the scheme is much too high and bulky especially when viewed from the South and will completely overwhelm the modest Colville Terrace properties. It will seriously damage the setting of the adjacent listed building and damage the quality and aspect of the conservation area

The idea to hack off the rendered areas off the external elevations of 27/29 Whitfield Street, repair the damaged brickwork and then apply a lime paint makes the scheme even more unwelcome. As can be seen from the samples undertaken on site the damage that will be done to the yellow stocks when the render is removed is very considerable. Indeed over half of the face of most bricks where the render has been removed have been damaged. If the report prepared by PAYE is to be believed in instances where the damage to the brick face is so great the brick will be replaced. The result will be that the majority of the facade will be rebuilt and the idea that the brickwork will somehow be blended in to match by way of applying a coloured lime wash is risible.

Moreover the lime wash finish is an entirely alien treatment in this part of the conservation area and will have the adverse effect of accentuating the already unwelcome bulk of the proposed extensions at third and fourth floor levels.

The proposed window fenestration is also very unwelcome and very unsympathetic to the pattern of openings especially along Colville Place.

The application will clearly damage the adjacent listed building and the conservation area. No justification to offset this damage in accordance with NPPF paragraph 132 have been put forward simply because none exists. The building is usable and is currently in use, it is in a sound condition and economically it is viable. There is absolutely no public gain contained in the application, only unjustified damage and harm to the conservation area and adjacent listed building.

Please can you advise me when the matter will be going to Committee. Presumably not till after the imminent local elections due to purdah rules and the fact that the scheme is so contentious.

I would also like confirmation that this is the only application lodged for this site and that all other 4 applications have been withdrawn by the applicant. If this is not the case please can you advise what other applications are pending to be resolved and their planning history and details within the Council system. A schedule of application numbers dates of submission and decisions if any or withdrawals would be appropriate so that it is possible to be absolutely clear what is the current situation .

Yours sincerely

Jim Monahan  
Architect

Flat 5 Goldsmith Court,  
Stukeley Street  
London WC2B 5LF



This e-mail transmission is strictly confidential and intended solely for the person or organisation to whom it is addressed. It may contain privileged and confidential information and if you are not the intended recipient, you must not copy, distribute or take any action that is reliant on it. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us as soon as possible and delete it.

We have taken precautions to minimize the risk of transmitting software viruses, but we would advise you to carry out your own virus checks on any attachment to this message. We cannot accept liability for any loss or damage caused by software viruses.

monahan  
blythen  
hopkins  
architects

[www.mbharchitects.co.uk](http://www.mbharchitects.co.uk)

Ms Laura Hazelton  
Camden Planning Department  
Development Manager  
Camden Town Hall  
Judd Street  
London WC1H 8NP

1 February 2018

by email and post

Dear Ms Hazelton

**Re: 27/29 Whitfield Street W1T 2SE Planning Ref 2017/6922/P**

I see that yet another application has now been submitted for this site that presumably is running concurrently with the scheme that I had previously lodged an objection at the end of last year.

I am writing to object to this new application. If granted it will irrevocably damage the setting of a very significant modest listed modern building adjacent and seriously damage the Fitzrovia Conservation Area.

The development is a gross overdevelopment; the modest three storey property is proposed to be increased in height by two storeys the top floor containing a very large plant room and includes a staircase enclosure; the two additional floors will overwhelm the listed building adjacent and be extremely damaging to the aspect and visual appearance of very pleasant domestic Colville Place adjacent and will erode the quality of the conservation area.

National Planning Guidance is quite clear that where a scheme causes substantial harm to the setting of a listed building and to the conservation area then unless there are overwhelming advantages that can be demonstrated, the presumption is that planning authorities should refuse permission. Plonking on an additional two storeys on 27/29 Whitfield Street will clearly damage the scale of the Whitfield Street terrace and be overbearing and damaging to 1 Colville Place that is adjacent and is listed building.

If the Council consider that the damage is not substantial, a stance which will discredit the credibility of the department, demonstrably is still harmful, there is still the fact that this harm has to be shown to be balanced by some meaningful public gain.

The building is in good condition; it is currently partially occupied and has been for the past two/three years while the plethora of various planning applications have been submitted; there is nothing to stop the full occupation of the building. The



landlord chooses not to do so but this not a reason to justify the harm to the listed building and conservation area. In addition the suggestion that a commercial art gallery at basement and ground floor level is a public benefit is preposterous. There are many art galleries in the locality and one more is no gain that can outweigh the harm the scheme will demonstrably do to the the listed building and the conservation area. Since when has a commercial use (that can change as multiple use classes have been applied for), justify damaging permanently the setting of an adjacent listed building and a very strategic view within the conservation area.


The Council should make it clear to the applicant that a scheme with an additional floor at third floor level is not acceptable; the existing roof plan has a very modest 2 sq.m water tank housing that is not visible from Whitfield Street whereas what is being proposed is two additional floors that will completely dominate the street scape and swamp the current delicate relationship with the three storey modest residential Colville Place terrace and the current polite relationship with the adjacent listed 1 Colville Place.

This is the fundamental flaw of the proposal and the Council needs to come to grips with this point; all the problems of overlooking, failure to respect the conservation area, damage to the setting of the adjacent listed building follow on from the fact that the scheme is too big, too greedy, too crude and mediocre for such an important corner site and whatever small amendments and revisions that might be offered unless this major defect is addressed then the consequential defects will always remain.

The roof terrace at fourth floor level designated for amenity use by the occupants of the offices will cause serious noise disturbance over a wide area in this concentration of residential uses, and will directly overlook the terrace of it's neighbour.

The scheme is dreadful is should be refused and the refusal notice should make it clear that the proposed two storey extension is unacceptable. The scheme falls foul of national planning policy as regards to protecting listed buildings, Camden's planning policies concerning protecting and enhancing conservation areas, Camden design standards and not least Camden's planning policies concerning the protection of visual and physical amenity of existing residential accommodation from new (commercial) development.

Yours sincerely,



Jim Monahan