



By Email

London Borough of Camden
Development Management
Town Hall
Argyle Street
London
WC1H 8EQ

21st November 2018

Dear Mr T Sild,

Application Reference No. 2018/4504/P Proposed Development at 71 Endell Street, London WC2H 9AJ Impact on Flat 3, 74 Neal Street

In addition to the letter sent by Ms Shirley Ellis from Right of Light Consulting on the 14/11/18, I would like to object to the proposed rooftop extension at 71 Endell Street. My reasons are the clear breach of BRE guidelines, impact on my legal right to light, the overbearing bulky design and design (including materials) not fitting with that of the local area.

The topics of breach of BRE guidelines and impact on my legal right to light have already been addressed in the letter from Right of Light Consulting. Please can I ask you kindly to refer to this instead of simply repeating the views contained in it, which I support. The only aspect I would like to raise in addition is that the eb7 report admits openly that there are many unknowns in respect to their assessment. I was very disappointed, therefore, to see that in the instances when the author makes assumptions due to lack of exact information that these assumptions lean very heavily in the favour of the developer and against the local residents. This leads me to view this report as materially unbalanced. In the interest of a fair, open assessment we kindly request for the full report and calculations to be shared with Right of Light Consulting for their appraisal with their feedback being carefully considered by yourself before any decisions are made.

The design of the rooftop extension results in my property and garden being entirely overshadowed. Visually it is an unattractive, large, square bulky structure. All the windows across two floors on the one side of my property will directly look onto the blank, flat structure. Currently they enjoy a view across the Endell Street properties in the distance. This development materially diminishes the skyline, the view and garden area. Furthermore, the proposed building materials I do not see as fitting with the character of the local area. I am sure a quick visit to the site by yourself would reveal this inconsistency in the application.

The applicant interestingly references an approved application from 1989. Besides from noting that the important BRE guidelines were brought in after this date (and so that application should have no bearing on the current one) what this previous application usefully shows is the positive aesthetics and light implications that come from a curved/angled rooftop that is also slightly setback. I copy a

screenshot of the relevant image below for ease of reference. This design is materially shorter than the current application, the curved/angled shape of the structure allows more light that one at right-angles, it is not so overbearing and is set back from the current wall by a decent margin. I believe these important considerations should be taken on board and if, eventually after the right of light and BRE guideline topics are fairly addressed, Camden Council see fit to agree a development that amendments be made to the design to incorporate these improvements. The effect will be to reduce the undoubtedly negative effects of the development.

It is for all these reasons I object to the planning application. It will certainly have a materially negative effect on my home and garden.

I would like to thank you for your time and fair consideration. I remain open to any questions you have and, as noted in the Right of Light Consulting letter, if you would like to visit my property to get a better understanding of the impact this development will have I would be happy to arrange.

Yours sincerely,

Henry Hogarth

