Our Ref: DBB/OCO1/1
Your Ref: 2020/0006/P

14 February 2020

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



BH1 1NU

**Dear Sirs** 

RE: 60 Charlotte Street - Objection to 2020/0006/P

We have been instructed by Mr O'Connell, the owner of 16 Scala Street, to assess the current application at 60 Charlotte Street for use of the third floor roof opposite his property as a terrace. Having considered the proposal and adopted policies of the Local Development Plan, we write to OBJECT on his behalf.

The "terrace" is not established, the previous application attempting to introduce this feature was rightly amended and the terrace was removed from the proposal. From the submitted plans it appears that access to the terrace is via a ladder and therefore any use of this area as a space for the offices will have an impact on the character of the area.

The application once again seeks to deceive the decision makers though their illustration of views "from parapet to opposing roof", which fails to reflect that there is a habitable room and window in that roof space. The applicant seems to justify this gross overlooking and loss of privacy based upon the existing relationship between the two buildings. However, we strongly disagree that harmful overlooking that does not meet the adopted LPA standard can be used as an excuse to make the situation worse. The scheme is therefore clearly contrary to the aims of Policy A1.

The application is accompanied with photographs taken on the roof, looking east and west, but bizarrely (or just conveniently) not including the views to the south and into the windows of the homes on Scala Street. As before please find below a photograph taken from the residential window which clearly shows that the terrace would be an invasion of privacy both through perceived and actual overlooking.

The use of angled lines to illustrate the relationship between the offices and residential properties claims that the distance to the nearest habitable window, looking at an angle downward is 13.7m

but to the neighbouring roof is only 11.5m. This ignores the fact that there is a bedroom window contained within that very roof space, which looks directly across to the office building. Bringing activity closer to this window is unacceptable:



The first consideration of Policy A1 criterion (a) is to "ensure that the amenity of communities, occupiers and neighbours is protected". Factors relating to this are visual privacy and noise, both elements which will be compromised if this proposed terrace were to gain consent; the noise would be unobstructed as would the invasion of privacy.

The previous application highlighted the change in floor levels between the existing office and the area proposed as a terrace, which was approximately 0.45m and which would have required the installation of three steps. This latest application is however silent on this point, which is strange considering that it is a material consideration of the application if the users of the terrace need to climb to an increased floor height, which would not only bring the activity closer to Scala Street, but at an increased vantage point to overlook.

The intended use of the proposed terrace is for the workers of the office and yet the applicant considers that hours of use are not applicable to this application. There is no justification or need for the introduction of this terrace overlooking the quieter residential side street and to claim that the use will be limited to "office hours" is meaningless.

The proposal is contrary to the adopted Local Development Plan and there are no material considerations to justify this departure, therefore we would be obliged if you could take these points into consideration when making your recommendation and refuse the application.

Should you require anything further at this time please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours faithfully



HLF Planning Ltd david@alpplanning.co.uk