
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 November 2019 22:42
To: Sild, Thomas
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Planning application No 2019/4573/P - 25 Shelton Street London WC2
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Sir

We have tried to register our comments on the above application and our objection to it but have been unable to master your online system for doing so. Accordingly kindly take this email as our formal objection.

We live at 40 Earlham Street, which directly abuts the court yard which is proposed to be covered according to the application.

Our objections are as follows

1 The area around Seven Dials is characterised by the small court yards, such as the yard behind 40 Earlham Street and the Neal's Yard court yard. Indeed now that the Seven Dials Market has been opened that too is in the nature of an enclosed court yard. The proposal to enclose the yard behind No 40 will eliminate one of those yards and thus damage the heritage of the area. The previous proposal (2018/0846/P) granted on 10th August 2018 did not do so because by having a glass roof the essential nature of the yard as an open feeling space was not lost. The latest application is materially less attractive than that application. Local Plan Policy D2 (Heritage) requires all developments to preserve and where appropriate to enhance Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings. By simply extending the retail space on the ground floor of No 25 Shelton Street the proposal does nothing to enhance the heritage site and indeed effectively destroys any semblance of a court yard.

2 The existing court yard behind no 40 provides access to the rear of No 40 for the purposes of maintaining and decorating the building and cleaning the windows. In the unfortunate event of the destruction of no 40 by fire or other causes 40 Earlham Street Property Limited (the freeholder) as the freehold owner of No 40 has the right of access through the yard for the purposes of rebuilding No 40. Even if some access is provided via the proposed roof of the yard the access to which the freeholder is entitled will at least be compromised and at worst made impossible. Nothing is said in the application which guarantees the freeholder right of access via the proposed roof to carry out maintenance, decorations and rebuilding works. If the Council is minded despite the comments in para 1 above to grant the application the permission must ensure unrestricted access to the yard and the roof to carry out such works.

3 The residents of No 40 have a right to escape in the event of fire through the yard behind No 40. By enclosing the yard in the way proposed that right will be impeded with consequential risks to the safety of the residents of No 40. Any permission granted must ensure that such rights are preserved, and that in the event of fire the residents of no 40 can escape through the enclosed yard.

4 The plans submitted with the application do not make it clear how the proposed roof will be drained. The proposal says the building will be free standing although that is not apparent from the drawings, which rather suggest that it will be linked to No 40. Any permission given must ensure that no water can drain onto the walls of No 40 as that will create damp problems particularly at basement level.

5 We were assured in relation to the previous planning application referred to in paragraph 1 above that the glass roof would be sufficiently thick to ensure that no noise could penetrate it. Shop premises these days can make considerable noise. Given the way in which the yard is surrounded by very high wall any noise is likely to reverberate and intensify. Any planning consent must ensure that no noise can be heard through the roof.

6 Although there are only three roof lights they are quite large and the risk of light pollution is still there with this proposal. Any planning consent should ensure that no lights are shown in the extension after 10 pm at night

7 Security is of great concern to the residents of no 40 and any consent must ensure that the doors onto Earlham Street are locked shut when the premises are unoccupied. Once access has been obtained to the yard it would be very easy to access the roof and from the roof flats in No 40.

Yours faithfully

Lynne Kirwin and Geoffrey Davies

40H Earlham Street
London WC2H 9LH

