

## Hazelton, Laura

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 27 October 2018 20:53  
**To:** Hazelton, Laura  
**Subject:** Objection to 70 Oakley square 2018/4802/P and 2018/4862/L  
**Importance:** High

Dear Laura,

Please find below an objection to the proposals for 70 Oakley Square - Please redact my name as I do not wish the applicant to know my name or whereabouts given how relatively close I am to this property. It is a pity that there seems so little regard for how good this end elevation is for the terrace.

There is an assumption in the application that subdivision will preserve or enhance the listed building. This is not the case, as the original planform without alteration is the most desirable condition of the listed building.

If there is an overriding need to add two housing units at market rates to the sum of Camden property (none of which will be remotely affordable to those of average or below income so fails to address low income housing need), the next question is whether internal subdivision requires the opening up of the blind side windows. I take issue with the following statements in the PDAH statement:

2.5 *"This will be partly aided by the reopening of five blind architraves"*

It must be noted that these windows were never open, so 2.5 is either deliberately misleading or poor judgement. The error continues in section 2.6:

2.6 *"the applicant is seeking to propose minimal external alterations, with the only changes being applied to better reveal the original fabric and character of the building".*

Opening the blind windows that were originally blind does not better reveal the original fabric and character.

The reference to the NPPF is also imprecise. The criteria cited are less than appropriate - Para 192 a) "viable use" is irrelevant as the use as a dwelling is current and viable, the loss of the original blind windows neither sustaining nor enhancing this decorative treatment to the party wall facing Eversholt Street. The use of blind windows occurs on houses of relatively high status (examples are seen within the Bedford Estate to the South) and are considered treatments of otherwise blind walls that acknowledge the importance of the adjoining street without interfering with the standardised floor plan in this type of dwelling. With so many corner sites being adapted or built against, there is a real loss of examples of this form of urban good manners in Camden Town, which has relatively few streets with housing of this grandeur.

On to the detailed discussion of the plan and the NECESSITY to open the windows:

On First floor there are the two existing large sash windows to the square serving the proposed living room - there is no necessity or justification for adding a third window to this room. The stair window is already in place.

On the second and third floor each bedroom has a large sash window facing Oakley Square. The bedroom against the side wall DOES NOT require an additional window to make the room either habitable or pleasant.

In conclusion there is no NECESSITY to open any of the side windows in order to facilitate the rooms to be either habitable or even 'better' as each has at least one primary window to the square, even if one accepts that alteration to plan form to carve the building into three flats is justified in unit terms. Changes in the fabric of a listed building requires clear justification or benefit to be demonstrated in order to sustain viable use or enhance significance - the loss of original blind windows for no justifiable reason fails this test.

Kind regards,

