

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4427/P	Paola Nicolaides	28/12/2020 16:26:02	OBJNOT	<p>We would like to object to the proposed rear extension of 67 Charlotte Street on the grounds that it will cause</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Loss of Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing</li> <li>2. Overlooking and or loss of privacy</li> <li>3. Loss of amenity in habitable rooms</li> </ol> <p>to the ground floor, first and second floors of 27 Tottenham Street. A large number of windows are affected. We believe that the loss of light is substantially outside the guidelines. All windows of the back of the properties are affected. The affected building has a particularly strong requirement for light.</p> <p>The block of buildings was built during the Georgian period and it consists of a vast empty space in the middle. One of the main reasons why the empty space exists is to allow direct sunlight to penetrate in the buildings.</p> <p>The proposed rear extension would block direct sunlight to the inhabitants of the first and second floor of 27 Tottenham Street. This is our main source of sunlight as the windows are south facing. The proposed development would also block direct sunlight to the ground floor and basement businesses.</p> <p>The Daylight Sunlight and Overshadowing Assessment fails to mention in their report on how the ground floor of 27 Tottenham St is affected as there is a window which provides sunlight on the back of the building which will completely disappear. Also it suggests that the effect on 27 Tottenham St is "negligible" which is entirely false given that they are south facing windows and provide Daylight/Sunlight to rooms which are habitable. A simple picture from the windows would demonstrate how direct sunlight and daylight in general would get blocked.</p> <p>Additionally, the views from the south facing windows of the first and second floor would also be obstructed by the extension as the proposed extension is too close to 27 Tottenham St. Privacy will be diminished greatly by the proposed additions.</p> <p>For these reasons, we object to the proposals.</p> <p>Given the amount of impact to our properties and the adverse effects it is not possible to conclude that the proposed developments satisfy the required guidelines. The report by Hawkins Environmental admits that for most windows of 27 Tottenham St it does not meet the BRE Guidelines. We add that the effect to the total building is such that it cannot be considered within the Guidelines nor can be accepted by the Council.</p> <p>I am owner and director of the Company which is the Landlord of 27 Tottenham St, Fitzrovia, London W1T 4RW, United Kingdom. Our legal representative in Cyprus has already filed an objection on our behalf. This is in addition to that. Given that we live in Cyprus we only just got notified of the proposed planning application and therefore did not have enough time to gather further evidence of the adverse impact to accompany the present objection. We shall provide photographs from the windows which will be adversely affected by the extension via email. We also request further time to provide independent study which contradicts the assessment and shows that the effect to our buildings is not negligible as suggested.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4427/P	Paola Nicolaides	28/12/2020 16:34:18	OBJNOT	<p>We would like to object to the proposed rear extension of 67 Charlotte Street on the grounds that it will cause</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Loss of Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing</li> <li>2. Overlooking and or loss of privacy</li> <li>3. Loss of amenity in habitable rooms</li> </ol> <p>to the ground floor, first and second floors of 27 Tottenham Street. A large number of windows are affected. We believe that the loss of light is substantially outside the guidelines. All windows of the back of the properties are affected. The affected building has a particularly strong requirement for light.</p> <p>The block of buildings was built during the Georgian period and it consists of a vast empty space in the middle. One of the main reasons why the empty space exists is to allow direct sunlight to penetrate in the buildings.</p> <p>The proposed rear extension would block direct sunlight to the inhabitants of the first and second floor of 27 Tottenham Street. This is our main source of sunlight as the windows are south facing. The proposed development would also block direct sunlight to the ground floor and basement businesses.</p> <p>The Daylight Sunlight and Overshadowing Assessment fails to mention in their report on how the ground floor of 27 Tottenham St is affected as there is a window which provides sunlight on the back of the building which will completely disappear. Also it suggests that the effect on 27 Tottenham St is "negligible" which is entirely false given that they are south facing windows and provide Daylight/Sunlight to rooms which are habitable. A simple picture from the windows would demonstrate how direct sunlight and daylight in general would get blocked.</p> <p>Additionally, the views from the south facing windows of the first and second floor would also be obstructed by the extension as the proposed extension is too close to 27 Tottenham St. Privacy will be diminished greatly by the proposed additions.</p> <p>For these reasons, we object to the proposals.</p> <p>Given the amount of impact to our properties and the adverse effects it is not possible to conclude that the proposed developments satisfy the required guidelines. The report by Hawkins Environmental admits that for most windows of 27 Tottenham St it does not meet the BRE Guidelines. We add that the effect to the total building is such that it cannot be considered within the Guidelines nor can be accepted by the Council.</p> <p>I am owner and director of the Company which is the Landlord of 27 Tottenham St, Fitzrovia, London W1T 4RW, United Kingdom. Our legal representative in Cyprus has already filed an objection on our behalf. This is in addition to that. Given that we live in Cyprus we only just got notified of the proposed planning application and therefore did not have enough time to gather further evidence of the adverse impact to accompany the present objection. We shall provide photographs from the windows which will be adversely affected by the extension via email. We also request further time to provide independent study which contradicts the assessment and shows that the effect to our buildings is not negligible as suggested.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4427/P	Gina Maria Palermo	27/12/2020 16:45:00	OBJ	<p>We would like to object to the proposed rear extension of 67 Charlotte Street on the grounds that it will block direct sunlight to the ground, first and second floors of 27 and 29 Tottenham Street.</p> <p>The block of buildings was built during the Georgian period and it consists of a vast empty space in the middle. One of the main reasons why the empty space exists is to allow direct sunlight to penetrate in the buildings.</p> <p>The proposed rear extension would block direct sunlight to the inhabitants of the first and second floor of 27 and 29 Tottenham Street. This is our main source of sunlight as the windows are south facing. The proposed development would also block direct sunlight to the ground floor and basement businesses.</p> <p>The Daylight Sunlight and Overshadowing Assessment fails to mention this in their report. A simple picture from the windows would demonstrate how direct sunlight would get blocked.</p> <p>Additionally, the views from the south facing windows of the first and second floor would also be obstructed by the extension. For these reasons, we object to the proposals.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4427/P	Constantinos Clerides	28/12/2020 14:53:50	OBJ	<p>We would like to object to the proposed rear extension of 67 Charlotte Street on the grounds that it will cause</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Loss of Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing</li> <li>2. Overlooking and or loss of privacy</li> <li>3. Loss of amenity in habitable rooms</li> </ol> <p>to the ground floor, first and second floors of 27 Tottenham Street. A large number of windows are affected. We believe that the loss of light is substantially outside the guidelines. All windows of the back of the properties are affected. The affected building has a particularly strong requirement for light.</p> <p>The block of buildings was built during the Georgian period and it consists of a vast empty space in the middle. One of the main reasons why the empty space exists is to allow direct sunlight to penetrate in the buildings.</p> <p>The proposed rear extension would block direct sunlight to the inhabitants of the first and second floor of 27 Tottenham Street. This is our main source of sunlight as the windows are south facing. The proposed development would also block direct sunlight to the ground floor and basement businesses.</p> <p>The Daylight Sunlight and Overshadowing Assessment fails to mention in their report on how the ground floor of 27 Tottenham St is affected as there is a window which provides sunlight on the back of the building which will completely disappear. Also it suggests that the effect on 27 Tottenham St is "negligible" which is entirely false given that they are south facing windows and provide Daylight/Sunlight to rooms which are habitable. A simple picture from the windows would demonstrate how direct sunlight and daylight in general would get blocked.</p> <p>Additionally, the views from the south facing windows of the first and second floor would also be obstructed by the extension as the proposed extension is too close to 27 Tottenham St. Privacy will be diminished greatly by the proposed additions.</p> <p>For these reasons, we object to the proposals.</p> <p>Given the amount of impact to our properties and the adverse effects it is not possible to conclude that the proposed developments satisfy the required guidelines. The report by Hawkins Environmental admits that for most windows of 27 Tottenham St it does not meet the BRE Guidelines. We add that the effect to the total building is such that it cannot be considered within the Guidelines nor can be accepted by the Council.</p> <p>I represent the Landlord of 27 Tottenham St, Fitzrovia, London W1T 4RW, United Kingdom. Given that the Landlord lives in Cyprus they only just got notified of the proposed planning application and therefore did not have enough time to gather further evidence of the adverse impact to accompany the present objection. We shall provide photographs from the windows which will be adversely affected by the extension via email. We also request further time to provide independent study which contradicts the assessment and shows that the effect to our buildings is not negligible as suggested.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4427/P	G Arnott & L Waughman	21/12/2020 19:29:08	OBJ	<p>Planning Application 67 Charlotte St 2020/4427/P:</p> <p>We live at 31a Tottenham Street W1T 4RR; our property backs onto 67 Charlotte Street where the changes to the restaurant and kitchen are proposed at basement and ground floor levels.</p> <p>Statutory Publicity Requirements:</p> <p>The planning notification notices have been removed from the posts in the area, outside 67 Charlotte Street and the neighbouring properties in Tottenham Street. The removal appears to have been deliberate as we found one of the notices cut up into several pieces on the footpath amongst the rubbish awaiting collection. We can supply time-stamped photos to support this if required.</p> <p>We note that other planning notices attached to posts in the immediate area have not been touched, so it would appear that only the notices for this specific application have been removed.</p> <p>We rang Camden Planning on the 14th December 15:38 – 15:50 pm to advise them of the situation – and spoke with a gentleman called Daniel who took the information and provided a reference: 02820. We were told we would be called back, but have yet to receive a call.</p> <p>We have spoken with some neighbours who may be affected by the but were not aware there is an application as there is no site notice.</p> <p>We understand that there is a statutory obligation for a site notice or neighbour notification letter. As there has now been no site notice or neighbour notification letter, we would expect that the application is delayed until the statutory publicity requirements have been fulfilled.</p> <p>Demolition:</p> <p>We are surprised that demolition of the property's exterior has already commenced: 21/12/2020 extensive demolition and removal of wall (shown as 'existing ground floor, unit 1' on the submitted plans). We would have thought this was premature and would require planning consent. We can supply time stamped-photos to support this if required.</p> <p>Rear skylights:</p> <p>We note there are skylights proposed for both the basement and ground floor levels at the rear above both the kitchen and restaurant areas.</p> <p>These skylights are directly adjacent to the rear of our four-floor home and below our habitable rooms, including a bedroom. Because of the inevitable noise that will occur from a busy (and to be enlarged) restaurant and kitchen, we would like to ensure that the skylights are fixed (have no means of opening) and are soundproofed to the extent that no noise whatsoever can be heard outside from the restaurant and/or kitchen.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

We understand that the current licence for the restaurant includes opening till the following hours (including late night refreshment):

Monday – Saturday (excluding Christmas Day and Good Friday): 00.30

Sunday, Christmas Day and Good Friday: 00.00

There is also provision for music and dancing.

It should be noted that kitchen activity and associated noise generally carries on well beyond these hours for cleaning, etc.

Because of the hours of operation of the restaurant, which backs onto a high density of residential properties (the entire length of the restaurant is adjacent to residential above) and the capacity of the restaurant being increased, we would like the planning to be conditional on these skylights being completely fixed closed and fully soundproofed or we object on the grounds of the adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours, by reason of noise.

Outside areas at rear:

Running the length of the rear restaurant /kitchen at ground and basement level there is an area described as 'not surveyed'.

At present, there are no proposed windows or doors shown at basement level leading to this area, but there is one door shown at ground floor level though it is unclear where or to which level this leads.

We would like to ensure that there are no doors/windows proposed that open onto the rear outside areas, and also that none of the outside area will not be used for any activity from the restaurant/kitchen, including (but not limited to) food preparation, waste deposit/storage, a staff and/or customer smoking area.

Should there be any doors/windows proposed or any usage as described above, then we would object on the grounds of the adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours, by reason of noise and, potentially, odour.

Extract/flue and air-conditioning:

We note that the existing flue/extract and air-conditioning are being removed and that the area they occupy is to be built over.

Strangely, we see no proposal for a new flue/extract and air-conditioning in the application, which the restaurant would require.

As no proposal has been submitted, then we would expect that no new flue/extract and air-conditioning can be fitted without a separate planning application. However, we see that the proposed extension to the building severely restricts the potential positioning options for these. Therefore, the whole new development should not

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:

Response:

be allowed until it is shown that it can accommodate these items of plant and not preclude the best positioning.

A new flue/extract would need to meet DEFRA guidelines, including venting above the highest nearby window (which in this case would probably be the new dormer windows in their own proposed extension). A noise impact assessment for this new plant would also be required.

Good practice would also dictate that the flue should run up the back of their own building and vent around the apex of their own roof.

A flue/extract above the rear of the restaurant to the necessary height would be unacceptable to us: it would be an eyesore directly in our view from our windows and terrace. It is unlikely that it would disperse odours adequately as it would be in the centre of a residential block; noise mitigation would also be a problem.

We would also object to the positioning of air-conditioning units nearer to our property and consideration should be given to enclosing these (away from the neighbouring residential properties), as has been done at the recent development adjoining 67 Charlotte Street at 61-65 Charlotte Street.

Unless a suitable scheme is submitted in conjunction with this application and be open to viewing, scrutiny and comments from neighbours, we would object on the grounds of the potential adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours, by reason of noise, odour and visual unsightliness.

Excavation:

We would like clarification regarding the depth of the excavation. The application refers to an excavation of 1280mm; however, looking at the 'existing section' drawings, the excavation under the part referred to as 'Unit 1' would appear to require substantially more than 1280mm.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4427/P	Paola Nicolaides	28/12/2020 16:34:29	OBJ	<p>We would like to object to the proposed rear extension of 67 Charlotte Street on the grounds that it will cause</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Loss of Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing</li> <li>2. Overlooking and or loss of privacy</li> <li>3. Loss of amenity in habitable rooms</li> </ol> <p>to the ground floor, first and second floors of 27 Tottenham Street. A large number of windows are affected. We believe that the loss of light is substantially outside the guidelines. All windows of the back of the properties are affected. The affected building has a particularly strong requirement for light.</p> <p>The block of buildings was built during the Georgian period and it consists of a vast empty space in the middle. One of the main reasons why the empty space exists is to allow direct sunlight to penetrate in the buildings.</p> <p>The proposed rear extension would block direct sunlight to the inhabitants of the first and second floor of 27 Tottenham Street. This is our main source of sunlight as the windows are south facing. The proposed development would also block direct sunlight to the ground floor and basement businesses.</p> <p>The Daylight Sunlight and Overshadowing Assessment fails to mention in their report on how the ground floor of 27 Tottenham St is affected as there is a window which provides sunlight on the back of the building which will completely disappear. Also it suggests that the effect on 27 Tottenham St is "negligible" which is entirely false given that they are south facing windows and provide Daylight/Sunlight to rooms which are habitable. A simple picture from the windows would demonstrate how direct sunlight and daylight in general would get blocked.</p> <p>Additionally, the views from the south facing windows of the first and second floor would also be obstructed by the extension as the proposed extension is too close to 27 Tottenham St. Privacy will be diminished greatly by the proposed additions.</p> <p>For these reasons, we object to the proposals.</p> <p>Given the amount of impact to our properties and the adverse effects it is not possible to conclude that the proposed developments satisfy the required guidelines. The report by Hawkins Environmental admits that for most windows of 27 Tottenham St it does not meet the BRE Guidelines. We add that the effect to the total building is such that it cannot be considered within the Guidelines nor can be accepted by the Council.</p> <p>I am owner and director of the Company which is the Landlord of 27 Tottenham St, Fitzrovia, London W1T 4RW, United Kingdom. Our legal representative in Cyprus has already filed an objection on our behalf. This is in addition to that. Given that we live in Cyprus we only just got notified of the proposed planning application and therefore did not have enough time to gather further evidence of the adverse impact to accompany the present objection. We shall provide photographs from the windows which will be adversely affected by the extension via email. We also request further time to provide independent study which contradicts the assessment and shows that the effect to our buildings is not negligible as suggested.</p>