

KITTY EDWARDS-JONES
25B FITZROY SQUARE
LONDON W1T 6ER

FAO John Diver
Case Officer Planning Dept
London Borough of Camden
2nd Floor
5 Pancras Square
London
NIC 4AG

planning@camden.gov.uk
Tel 0207 974 6368

April 18th 2018

Dear John Diver,

Application No: 2018/1361/P
Application type: Full Planning Permission

Associated Application No: 2018/1481/L
Application type: Listed Building Consent

Re. Planning application - 28 Fitzroy Square, London W1T 6DD

I am writing with reference to the above planning applications (Full Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent) having spoken to you today.

Firstly, Fitzroy Square is arguably the finest and most complete Grade 1 and 2* Listed Georgian Squares in London.

Camden has a duty and responsibility to preserve this special area as part of our heritage under their policy document:

'FITZROY SQUARE CONSERVATION APPROVAL AND MANAGEMENT STATEMENT' named as 'Fitzroy Conservation Area'.

"The Council has proposed this area to be re-designated within its own boundary because of its distinct character"

Quote: *"Fitzrovia Square Conservation Area is a place of architectural and historical interest – even the smallest change can have an adverse effect on the area."*

"The council is seeking to protect the special nature of this important area".....

It is on the national heritage list for England

Main Areas of concern to which I object:

1. **Rear extension Roof Terrace - Loss of Residential Amenity**
2. **Plant unit /air conditioning located to the rear of the terrace - Loss of Residential Amenity**
3. **Underground Pavement Vaults - excavate down (for games room/storage)**
4. **Removal of existing (historical fireplaces) and replacement with new stone fireplace on ground and first floors.**
5. **Not informed by letter, many of the neighbours not aware of the Planning application.**

OBJECTIONS

1. New Roof Terrace at 1st Floor.

The proposed roof terrace extension on first floor rear level represents overdevelopment of this Heritage building which would adversely affect the setting of the Grade II* listed houses on the west side within this Grade 1 Listed Georgian Square, as well as being damaging to the conservation area as a whole.

Loss of residential amenity

Privacy

The proposed roof extension would have an impact on privacy issues for houses on the west terrace side of Fitzroy Square, also the houses in Fitzroy mews. In turn it would set a precedence for any of the houses wishing to erect a similar extension roof level/terrace in the future. This would have a major and detrimental impact on all those listed houses along the western terrace of Fitzroy Square, many of which are gradually being reverted back to residential use.

We are already feeling the effects of crowding and over development. The erection of a roof terrace extension represents a gross invasion of privacy, butting onto the back wall of the Mews houses No 9 & 10, just feet away from their windows (not to mention the large Plant unit sited next to the wall). It also invades the privacy of the adjoining western terrace houses on Fitzroy Square. Because of the slim width of the Fitzroy Square houses, any additional extension on the rear of these elegant houses would represent an intrusion, a sense of enclosure and massing would be very apparent.

Noise

The Mews properties and close proximity of the rear buildings on the west side of Fitzroy Square act as an echo chamber, so there is a serious risk of noise nuisance from any windows or roof terraces. The proposed terrace when in constant use by staff, voices will be magnified where even two people speaking in normal tones can be audible, their conversation being heard clearly. The use of a roof terrace would be detrimental to residential amenity. It would lead to a noise disturbance for the occupiers of nearby residential premises on Fitzroy Square.

2. Plant unit /air conditioning located on Terrace - noise impact.

The location of this large plant unit on the new proposed terrace is totally unacceptable. It will be on 24/7 (in varying degrees) and residents will be able to hear this (even with its acoustic housing) as even a domestic flue running can be audible and this continual noise would be detrimental to residential amenity.

My concerns are with the location of all mechanical services, 2x new air condensed units and the plumbing of steam from condensing boilers etc. and they should not be audible to any neighbours.

Lights - Low level lights are proposed on the new Terrace. The light unit specified is an up and down light which is likely to spill into neighbours bedrooms on the terrace side. The bedrooms of adjoining houses tend to be at the rear of the houses. We would not want to create more light pollution with additional lighting to the rear of these buildings where one sleeps at night.

3. Pavement Vaults - lowering floor to front Lightwell Vaults (for games room & storage).

Excavating underground historical pavement vaults is detrimental to the historical context of the house also drilling and underpinning 1 metre down below existing foundations is compromising the structure of the building. The site is also located directly above the Aquifer. The water table is highly sensitive and the aquifer can get contaminated affecting our drinking water. If planning was allowed, this will set a precedence for similar future applications. This could end up destabilising the foundations of the run of terraced houses like a pack of cards.

4. Fireplaces, doors/interiors

Fireplaces

Four new stone fireplaces have been specified on ground and first floors.

This is unacceptable as the original fireplaces to the house still appear to be in tact on the Ground floor front and First floor rear of the house (see photos attached in the document). Removing the originals (even if they are a later period) is a breach of the Heritage policy D2 document and all the original architectural interiors are Grade 2 * Listed and cannot be removed. Who in any event would want to replace an original marble fireplace with a reproduction stone version!

Doors

a) All internal doors should be checked if they are of a particular age and part of the original original fabric prior to works commencing (even doors of 70 years old have some significance in shaping the history of these unique houses).

b) 2nd Floor - Why is it necessary to demolish the existing wall and door in Managers Office leaving just the nib wall. Are these original structures?

c) Rear replacement double glazed door to terrace - Proposal to install a 'Slimlight' self cleaning door. It states that from a distance it looks like single glazing but close to it will look like a double glazed unit with the modern glass and glazing bars. An authentic looking door with the correct fine profile/nosing on the window bars should be employed, but it would be single glazed.

d) New Ground floor Window proposed to align with original on the opposite side. This seems too closely placed to the originally architectural rear window with not sufficient space between the two - an awkward and impractical design.

e) I object to the general puncturing of original fabric such as walls and demolition throughout the property.

5. Notification to freeholders

I am aware that few residents/freeholders received notice of the current planning application(s) and you should be aware that the lack of objections from these properties should not be construed as acceptance of the planning applications. The immediate neighbours complained that the first they heard of the application was when they received a recent letter from the party wall surveyors making an appointment for next week.

COMMENTS

Community Policy E2 - In this instance, I don't agree with the statement 'harnessing the benefits for local residents under community' and 'higher intensity development' of premises that are suitable for continued business'. That may be the case in a modern development but not appropriate in this kind of building where there is little room for expansion without compromising the integrity of the historical buildings.

Heritage Policy D2 - Respect the local context and character and must preserve and enhance historic environment and heritage assets in accordance with D2 Heritage.

I don't agree with the statement by the applicant that 'planning history is of particular relevance to the consideration of the application'. You cannot judge planning mistakes done in 1955 or even 1989. Since then we have become more aware of the importance of our heritage assets, particularly this unique and rare London square, as in Camden's pledge under their policy document to preserve this special area.

Impact on the conservation area

We are custodians of these Grade 1 & 2* listed buildings which are unique in their setting. I do not believe we should be allowing new build which creates additional and extended height such as roof extensions or terraces, thus ruining the proportion and balance of a Robert Adam Square and its environs and spoiling it for future generations.

I object to the insensitive proposed development as it will have an irreversible impact on these unique buildings.

Yours sincerely,

Kitty Edwards-Jones

NB. Please acknowledge receipt of this letter.