

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1890/P	Chris Baker	07/06/2018 15:56:12	OBJ	<p>I write in connection with the planning proposal for 45 New Compton Street Reference 2018/1890/P . I have carefully examined the plans and know the site well. I wish to object strongly to the proposed development for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. Conservation. 45 New Compton Street lies within the area designated by Camden as 'Denmark Street Conservation Area', centred on the historically highly significant St Giles' Church, which the proposed development directly overlooks from short distance. This designation requires that the area is seen as of "special architectural or historic interest, the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance". In fulfilling its legal duty to uphold this, the Council is invited to acknowledge that the proposed development neither preserves nor enhances. It fails in this regard because the proposal would see building of a lift shaft directly onto the pavement of the street, forming a restriction of the vista towards the end of New Compton Street and Central St Giles, and blocking the natural pattern of fenestration of the building from this angle. Copper is used in the finish of this additional structure, presumably to be seen as 'keying in' with the copper on the church roof. However, in this context there is an ugly architectural error in that copper is only used on the rooves, not elevations of the church and the resultant mix will appear incongruous, insulting the historic church and compromising its setting.</p> <p>2 Light Levels. In addition to the ugliness of the new lift shaft, the proposal calls for a large ground-level extension to the church side of the building. This will add considerably to the bulk of the building, using up almost all land within the plot, and building out very close to the boundary with the historic church. The flats would be dependent on roof lights to gain most of their light but I would ask that developer's claims of adequate light are checked. Considerable overhang of tree foliage together with the proximity of surrounding elevations will give inadequate light in my view and lead to poor-quality building.</p> <p>3 Car Parking. The proposed loss of all existing car parking spaces would give rise to increased demand for already very inadequate street parking. Existing residents who rely on the car park will therefore suffer serious disruption, particularly in the case of disabled residents who depend on this amenity. It should be noted that, in the planning submission, the developer wrongly states that Camden policy calls for the loss of car parking spaces. It is wholly wrong to imply this and there is no policy reason why existing provision need be lost.</p> <p>4 Access to the rear of the building. This will essentially be lost and fire access and window cleaning compromised.</p> <p>5 Overdevelopment. With the addition of a separate residential dwelling next to Pendrell House, the site will become almost 100% built. The proposed new retail space will add considerably to demands on an already very inadequate and narrow stretch of pavement, increasing traffic and potentially creating noise disturbance to all the flats above. The retail space would have to be 100% serviced from the street, with no rear access. A new door to the electricity substation adjacent to the main entrance will be very ugly. Nothing is added to the streetscape, to the locality, to the community in residence by this proposed development and it depends entirely on the green space of the churchyard adjoining, adding nothing to the environment at all. It is a maximally exploitative endeavour where even the new parts of the building have no integration with the old, and where a new lift shaft five stories high serves only one new floor and is designed to segregate new residents from old. The old building is literally being parasited by the new.</p> <p>6 Noise during Construction. This proposal is far reaching and very extensive in its effect on the building and</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1890/P	Kyran Woodward	07/06/2018 16:06:43	OBJ	<p>those who live there. If the development were to proceed there should be very specific limitations to the degree of building noise to safeguard the interests and health of residents.</p> <hr/> <p>My objections to these proposals are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1 Loss of car parking will result in increased street parking demand where the provision of this is already insufficient. It is not true that these spaces MUST be lost as the developer implies.2 The Denmark Street Conservation Area is not respected by these proposals and the sensitive setting of the church is compromised.3 The plans would see the overdevelopment of the site and exploit the historic church.4 Retail premises below the building would not be suited to the residential nature of the building or the narrow pavement at this point on the street.5 The new lift shaft will be ugly and too close to the street.6 The development will not improve the locality and a low-quality building will result. <hr/>