

5 June 2018

Planning Committee

Camden

Ref 2017/6922/P

Case officer: Laura Hazelton

Cyclone House 27 - 29 Whitefield Street London W1T 2SE.

Dear Sirs

1. Introduction

- a. I write in connection with the above planning application.
- b. I am a neighbor to this proposal and have lived in the nearby residence since 2007.
- c. I have examined the application and plans and I know the site well.
- d. I have objected to all the revisions by the applicant and maintain my position.
- e. I wish to object strongly to this planning application.
- f. The visual impact, effect on the character of a neighborhood, noise and disturbance, overlooking and loss of privacy are clear areas where this proposal will have an incredible negative effect on.
- g. The likely effect of the development on the residential amenity of neighbors is clearly an important consideration that needs to be looked at in this application.
- h. The proposed development is in a designated Conservation Area and next to a Listed Building.
- i. The next door building is on the statutory list of buildings of special architectural or historic interest.
- j. This proposed development will have an effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and on the setting of the next door Listed Building.
- k. Similar considerations would apply if the site is in a part of the country which has been officially designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty #

2. Design Element.

- a. The Design element of a large building as in the case of this application has to be considered carefully.
- b. Next to all the over houses in Colville place the development looks ugly.
- c. It is overbearing, out of scale and out of character in terms of its appearance compared with the existing development in the vicinity.
- d. A higher standard of design is expected in a Conservation Area, or where it affects the setting of a Listed Building.
- e. Councils are under a legal duty to have particular regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of a Conservation Area.
- f. A development such as this which adversely affect the setting of a Listed Building should not be acceptable.
- g. The impact of the development on the landscape is also be an important factor in a designated Area green area.

3. Windows

- a. The planned windows of this proposal will be overlooking the Crabtree Fields Park and the seating outside. The area will lose its private appeal and intimacy. This is difficult to find in London and here is a picture perfect area that will be effected.
- b. In terms of view I refer to the view of the listed building next to the view of the proposed development.
- c. Moreover the view of both properties side by side.

- d. Can we still enjoy the view of the listed property alongside the new proposed development?
- e. The enjoyment of a view is an important part of the residential amenity of a neighboring property.
- f. The loss of view with this new development will have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of that property.
- g. Loss of a view from a public viewpoint will have a wider impact on a neighborhood, and such matters ought to be taken into account.

4. Other objections

- a. Adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbors, by reason of noise, disturbance, overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing.
- b. Unacceptably high density / over-development of the site, which involves a loss to the space and visual look and the loss of the open aspect of the neighborhood.
- c. Visual impact of the development from all sides.
- d. Effect of the development on the character of the neighborhood
- e. Design including bulk and massing.
- f. The proposed development is over-bearing, out-of-scale or out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing buildings in the vicinity
- g. Next to a Listed Building, which has adverse effect of the development on the setting of the Listed Building.
- h. It has been noted by many residents and the council the significance of this corner building requires careful consideration and design. This planning application lacks any common sense or design which will enhance and preserve the area.
- i. The effect on the character of the neighborhood, excess noise and disturbance by the proposed space on the top floor.
- j. As per my earlier letters I seek again for the third time that the planning committee need to consider sending this application to design before a vote.

5. A destruction of Character and Style

- a. This application destroys the character of the stylish and gently character of the Grade II listed building next to it including the houses in Colville Place.
- b. More importantly the grade II listed building next door is a post war period building of incredible design,
- c. Importance and appeal too many in the community.
- d. Why has this application been allowed to destroy such a great architectural iconic residence?
- e. The magnificent and elegant grade II listed building will suffer in the shadows of the new building and there is no sympathetic design or considerations to the beauty of Colville Place.
- f. Nor does it give any solace to the lovely features of the grade II listed building.
- g. The planning committee needs urgently to rethink the application and seek a design which will enable a
- h. Greater awareness in the needs of the grade II listed building and Colville Place.
- i. The revised application again offers nothing new in terms of an improvement to the area with respect to design.
- j. The top of the building will be a visual eyesore for neighborhood.
- k. The idea of design in an area such as this is to have a consistent visual approach to the incredible, subtle and unique architecture and its surrounds.
- l. The application fails in this regard.
- m. The new application makes no sense in terms of beauty or practicality.
- n. This application lacks good design and does not contribute positively to the area. Design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, should not be accepted.
- o. There is a detrimental impact upon residential amenities and the visual impact of a development (what it will be like to look at?). This includes density, over-development, layout, design and external appearance of building.

- p. The application is not of similar design and the proposed features differ from neighbouring properties and this would make the new development stand out. There is no features I can see that the applicant has identified as a feature that his neighbours share.
- q. The scale and proportion are also vital here. The proposed development is not the same size as those that neighbour it. Therefore a greater consideration should be given to the impact it will have on its neighbours.
- r. The surrounding properties are characterised by a unique style which the applicant has not embraced.

6. Human Rights Act

- a. I also raise the point of objection of the responsibilities of the council under the Human Rights Act, in particular Protocol 1, Article 1. This states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions, which includes the home and other land.
- b. Additionally, Article 8 of the Human Rights Act states that a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life. Private and family life therefore encompasses not only the home but also the surroundings.

7. Exterior Cladding

- a. None of the nearby houses have any cladding. They are natural brick. I do not like any of the proposed cladding which dates the property and destroys the visual impact. This is critical as it is a corner block. There should be no cladding and the brick work should be restored to it's originally glory.

Sincerely

[Redacted Signature]

Edward Aydin

[Redacted Address]