

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1782/P	Richard Whish	12/06/2021 10:50:33	COMMENT	<p>I wish to register my strong objections to this application.</p> <p>I am the owner of Flat 14 Glebe House, which I acquired in 1996; Flat 14 is currently on the top floor of the building. Of course the proposal is to build an additional floor above my flat.</p> <p>I think that the proposal is inappropriate for Fitzrovia.</p> <p>To begin with, the buildings in Fitzroy Square and the surrounding streets are all of more or less the same height. This extra floor would raise the height of Glebe House significantly and this would detract from the visual amenity of the area. This will have an impact on the Fitzrovia environment. Fitzroy Square in particular is one of the lesser-known 'jewels' of this part of London.</p> <p>The proposed new build would inevitably affect local residents. One of the terrific thing about this part of London is that it still has a significant number of residents: they have not been squeezed out by commercial premises. Part of the appeal is its atmosphere of being quiet and airy with good light. The proposed development would inevitably affect the light of many residents in the area.</p> <p>I will inevitably be affected by the proposal in terms of privacy and noise. At the moment the building has a lift to the third floor; I then walk up two final flights of stairs to my flat, one other person who owns Flat 15 is in the same situation. The proposal includes the installation of new lift facilities, to my floor and to the new floor above. Far from this being an advantage to me (having a lift to my floor), I see this as a major change to my personal environment: there will inevitably be more noise, partly because of new traffic but also because the lift will now pass my flat on its way to the top floor.</p> <p>I urge the planning authority to reject this application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1782/P	Tony Meadows	11/06/2021 13:12:18	COMMNT	<p>I am owner 7 Fitzroy Mews W1T 6DQ. I strongly object to the proposal 2021/1782/P, it being a serious detriment to the amenity of my house.</p> <p>Loss of Daylight and Sunlight There is a serious and unacceptable loss of daylight and sunlight to my windows. I have set out the application proposal in section with distances measured from the ordnance survey and from the planning application. I have added the BRE Guideline angle of 25 degrees and the significant detriment to my Daylight and Sunlight of the current building can be seen. The BRE angles are Guidelines and the use of the angles do not represent an accurate assessment of the direct sunlight that my upper floor benefits from at this time of year. The application proposal will completely remove this sunlight, both from my window elevation and the roof lights installed to compensate from the losses already incurred by the permission for the existing building. This drawing has been issued to the Planning and Case Officer, Nathaniel Young.</p> <p>Out of Scale Development The visual impact is not that of a single storey extension, but of a two-storey extension at the building face above which at the present time there is a set-back to minimise the light cut-off.</p> <p>At present the top floor of the building is set back to minimise the impact on the daylight and sunlight in the Fitzroy Mews and Fitzroy Square houses. The new proposal not only adds a dominant floor to the Mews face of the existing building but also in so doing, blocks the present light angles from the set-back of the floor below.</p> <p>To show the overbearing impact of this I have developed the perspective of the proposal onto a photograph taken from immediately outside my property. The before and after's clearly show the impact on my daylight. The detriment needs no further explanation, other than by measurement it reduces the sky area by more than 20%. These drawings have been issued to the Planning and Case Officer, Nathaniel Young.</p> <p>Proposal Drawing Inaccuracies In carrying out this task I note that the application proposal daylight section is taken through one of the higher Fitzroy Square windows, and not the low-level residential windows that are even more detrimentally affected. While I cannot speak for my neighbours, I raise this point to indicate the detriment of the application proposal on the heritage assets of our conservation area. This drawing has been issued to the Planning and Case Officer, Nathaniel Young.</p> <p>Non-compliance with Camden Planning Guidelines This is an overbearing proposal of significant detriment that must not be permitted if the council's commitment to the residential amenity of Fitzroy Mews, Camdens Planning Guidance and the qualities of the Fitzroy Square conservation area are seriously intended.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1782/P	K Swiderek	12/06/2021 20:28:27	OBJ	<p>FAO Planning Officer Nathaniel Young</p> <p>K Swiderek</p> <p>Flat A 26 Fitzroy Square</p> <p>OBJECTION</p> <p>We hereby object to the proposed development at Glebe House (Application No. 2021/1782/P). The primary reasons for our objection are as follows:</p> <p>Blocking of Daylight / Sunlight to our floor and floors below:</p> <p>Our bedroom faces this building and fortunately as things are - it allows most of the sunlight right throughout the day. The extension will block out the sun, especially in Autumn Winter.</p> <p>You've got ugly television antennas already on top of the building, we presume these won't be boxed away or moved on top of any new structure - compromising things further.</p> <p>Privacy concerns:</p> <p>Adding another storey and an even better vantage point into our bedroom is unacceptable. As is creating further residential dwellings peering into our bedroom.</p> <p>The likely duration of works will further impact on privacy create unnecessary noise disturbance.</p> <p>No architectural merit:</p> <p>Weirdly out of proportion with the rest of the neighbouring buildings. Ugly, visually confusing and lacklustre 'architectural solution'. Why not make the current building look more in keeping with the surrounds rather than wacking on an extra floor. It's Fitzroy Mews, a charming and period cobblestone mews, not Kowloon in Hong Kong! This development is one of the most unnecessary I've come across in a long while.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1782P	Tony Meadows	11/06/2021 13:11:22	COMMNT	<p>I am the owner and resident of 1B Fitzroy Mews W1T 6DE. I strongly object to the proposal in planning application No. 2021/1782P, it being a serious detriment to the amenity of my house.</p> <p>Loss of Daylight and Sunlight There is a serious and unacceptable loss of daylight and sunlight to all of my windows. I have set out the application proposal in section and elevation with distances measured from the ordnance survey and from the planning application. I have added the BRE Guideline angles of 45 degrees and the obvious detriment to my Daylight and Sunlight can be seen. My drawing has been issued to the Planning and Case Officer, Nathaniel Young.</p> <p>Proposal Drawing Inaccuracies In carrying out this task it is evident that the application proposal drawings are highly inaccurate. They under-size the height of the proposal by ignoring the fact that the Price & Myers report requires a second structural floor above the existing roof. The application drawing also shows a rooftop plant room of 1.11m in height, when to work as shown in plan the building that houses the plantrooms and access stairs will need to be a minimum of 2.6m in height.</p> <p>Out of Scale Development The visual impact is not that of a single storey extension as stated in the application, but of a two-storey, 5.33m high extension at the building face.</p> <p>At present the top floor of the building is set back to minimise the impact on the daylight and sunlight in the Fitzroy Mews and Fitzroy Square houses. The new proposal not only adds a dominant floor to the Mews face of the existing building but also in so doing, blocks the present light angles from the set-back of the floor below.</p> <p>To show the overbearing impact of this development proposal I have applied the perspective of the proposal onto photographs taken from my residential windows at my lowest and upper-most floors, with the before and afteris clearly showing the visual impact and the detriment to my daylight and sunlight. The detriment is extensive and unacceptable. By measurement it reduces the sky area by more than 20% at each location. These drawings have been issued to the Planning and Case Officer, Nathaniel Young.</p> <p>Non-compliance with Camden Planning Guidelines This is an overbearing proposal of significant detriment that must not be permitted if the councils commitment to the residential amenity of Fitzroy Mews, Camdens Planning Guidance and the qualities of the Fitzroy Square conservation area are seriously intended.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1782/P	Fernando Mendes Stefánni	12/06/2021 17:46:03	OBJ	<p>As a resident on the first floor of the building I strongly oppose the construction of the additional floor. Such work would be a huge disruption in current residents' life, with no gain by the community itself. While the housing market in central London is extremely saturated, a months-long construction work for adding a single unit would barely have any positive impact in it. Moreover, there are a few things to consider about the building itself:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The deactivation of the lift for the time of the construction is an extreme prejudicial idea that will greatly impact the quality of life of residents in the higher floors. - The building has been exposed for at least 3 times to constant construction in the past 6 months only, with the constructions of new flats on Cleveland street, the re-pavement of the sidewalks and the remodelling of a ground-floor restaurant. While these 3 constructions provided people with a greater service or benefit, now we are being asked to withstand an even greater amount of noise disruption and possibly other complications for an floor extension that will only jeopardise the mews, Cleveland street and Fitzroy Garden. - After the pandemic, many residents have shifted towards a "work from home" life, so having a construction of this magnitude would disrupt our work lives significant, making it unacceptable
2021/1782/P	Maria	12/06/2021 14:54:06	APP	<p>I live right across the street from Glebe House, and I fully object to the planning of an additional floor of any sort. At the moment the building is taller than the one to its right and its already stopping precious sunlight from entering my bedroom and living room. Any additional height will hinder this more. I live on the ground floor in Carlton house and strongly object to this.</p> <p>Cleveland street is a very narrow road to begin with, we don't want to be closed in. There's been enough noise, disruption, building works on Cleveland street as it is [REDACTED] who struggles with the noise as is.</p> <p>The extension will greatly impact the look and feel of this area. It will look out of place.</p> <p>Times have changed for good now because of the impact of COVID, and many people will now be working from home. Both my partner and I work from home on a full time basis. Our quality of life at home is very important to our well being and mental health.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1782/P	Marcello Bernardi	12/06/2021 20:25:42	OBJ	<p>FAO Planning Officer Nathaniel Young</p> <p>M Bernardi</p> <p>Fiat A 26 Fitzroy Square</p> <p>OBJECTION</p> <p>We hereby object to the proposed development at Glebe House (Application No. 2021/1782/P). The primary reasons for our objection are as follows:</p> <p>Blocking of Daylight / Sunlight to our floor and floors below:</p> <p>Our bedroom faces this building and fortunately as things are - it allows most of the sunlight right throughout the day. The extension will block out the sun, especially in Autumn Winter.</p> <p>You've got ugly television antennas already on top of the building, we presume these won't be boxed away or moved on top of any new structure - compromising things further.</p> <p>Privacy concerns:</p> <p>Adding another storey and an even better vantage point into our bedroom is unacceptable. As is creating further residential dwellings peering into our bedroom.</p> <p>The likely duration of works will further impact on privacy create unnecessary noise disturbance.</p> <p>No architectural merit:</p> <p>Weirdly out of proportion with the rest of the neighbouring buildings. Ugly, visually confusing and lacklustre 'architectural solution'. Why not make the current building look more in keeping with the surrounds rather than wacking on an extra floor. It's Fitzroy Mews, a charming and period cobblestone mews, not Kowloon in Hong Kong! This development is one of the most unnecessary I've come across in a long while.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1782/P	Kitty Edwards-Jones (Director)	12/06/2021 15:58:38	OBJ	<p>Dear Nathaniel Young,</p> <p>Firstly, I wish to put on record that Fitzroy Square and the Western Terrace were not consulted by Camden Council of this planning application, even though the proposals would impact greatly on these Grade 1 & 2* Listed buildings and the immediate conservation area. Subsequently many of those wishing to object were not given that window of opportunity. Please may we request an extension for objections.</p> <p>OBJECTON</p> <p>I hereby strongly object to the proposed development to increase the height of an already over scaled building on the west side of Fitzroy Mews, namely Glebe House.</p> <p>I urge you to consider my objections for the following reasons:</p> <p>1.0 The Site Glebe House is currently over 4 stories high with an additional 5th floor roof access/plant space. This building is already more prominent than all the neighbouring properties in the area, including Cleveland Court, a handsome 1939 Art Deco mansion block on the immediate south side. A 5th & 6th extension will add further height and bulk impacting on the conservation area and dwarfing the Fitzroy Mews smaller houses which are sympathetically in scale and proportion, being the former coach houses to the Grade 1 & 2* Listed Robert Adam Fitzroy Square.</p> <p>1.3 The rear of Fitzroy Square western terrace is just 19 metres away, NOT 40 metres as stated in the application. 30 metres is to the front of the buildings on the square itself. Therefore the proposed development is very close to the rear windows of Fitzroy Square Western Terrace and the additional height extension will have a massive impact on these houses and quality of life for those living and working here.</p> <p>2.0 The Building 2.4 'The building is of no architectural merit' - therefore it should allow the surrounding buildings and street scene room to breath rather than dominating them. 2.4 'Rear of the building at low level is rather messy, detracting from the appearance of the mews' - then why not simply introduce a non evasive improvement plan and re-decoration for continuity and rhythm, a sympathetic solution rather than imposing major destructive works to neighbours and compromising the integrity of the conservation area. 2.4 'Individual aerials at roof level are quote prominent' indeed common to many apartment blocks and easily remedied by introducing a communal aerial appropriately positioned.</p> <p>3.0 The Character of the Surroundings 3.2 Cleveland Street should retain the rhythm and character of the Georgian and Victorian houses. There is little evidence of the rhythm being punctuated by larger buildings.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

Ref: the large prominent 2 story roof top extension clad in vibrant copper, is not a relevant argument nor a reason to allow the extension to Glebe House. This university building is a design statement that is spatially aware and appropriate to its setting on the main Euston Road with its junction on Cleveland street.
 Ref: to the 5 story building - it is a period property circa 1930s to which a later floor has been added blending sympathetically with the original corner property. It has ample space around it and is not dominant on the street scene.
 Ref: Bromley Arms 'a larger 4 story property' sits in line with the original Georgian terrace at the junction to Maple Street, sympathetically retaining the original roof line.
 - BT Tower - it is absurd to refer to this iconic 1960s Grade 2 listed building as very prominent! Mentioned 3 times!
 3.3 The Fitzroy Mews houses adjoining the rear of Fitzroy Square Western Terrace in this quiet narrow cobbled street will also be adversely affected, not only by loss of light but the scale and proportion of the proposed development will be overwhelming. While modern in style, as the former coach houses of Fitzroy Square they echo the character of a period mews both in height and scale.

4.0 Heritage
 Fitzroy Square Grade 1 & 2* Listed houses, particularly the Western Terrace, will be adversely affected by loss of daylight and sunlight from their basements to and including 1st floor levels. 2nd and 3rd floors will be overlooked.
 The size and scale of the increased height of the proposed development impact not only on the Western side terraces of Fitzroy Square but also the Robert Adam houses in this conservation area of major historic significance.
 The proposed development is in the heart of the Fitzroy Square Conservation Area, 30 metres away from the front terraces and just 19 metres away from the rear windows on the western terrace. Not 40 metres as stated in the application.
 4.6 Glebe House and Cleveland Court are of different scale and materials
 - Cleveland Court is typical of design form and brickwork used during the 1930s for a mansion block of this type and lends its own charm and character to the street scene positioned on a corner site.

5.0 The Proposals
 Noted that an extended sloped mansard roof form has been developed to the Cleveland Street frontage to reduce the visual height and 'to contribute to a greater vertical rhythm'. Yet Fitzroy Mews to the rear has a vertical treatment, not stepped back, therefore giving an even greater impression of imposing height and over crowding in an already narrow mews. Also, why design a north facing terrace?
 5.3 Concerns about metal cladding, colour and reflective nuisance. White horizontal cladding is inconspicuous and blends in with the sky, a dark zinc clad colour will be prominent against the sky line and more imposing, especially when exposed at greater height from neighbours windows and their sight lines.

6.0 Impact of the Proposals
 The 6th story extension will 100% adversely affect the nearby surroundings, overlooking, loss of sunlight and daylight from neighbouring properties, especially the Western Terrace of Fitzroy Square where a number of properties from basement level to first floor will be overlooked and lose their right to light. This will have an adverse and irreversible impact on the Fitzroy Square Conservation Area.

6.4 Ditto the adverse impact of proposed height on Fitzroy Mews. Recommendation of improvement at low

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

level only and scrap the extension. Less devastation for neighbours.
Longer views have not been considered thoroughly, e.g. the proposal is also visible from Carburton Street and disproportional in size and character of surrounding buildings.
Fitzroy Square - while Glebe House may not currently be seen across Fitzroy Square gardens at ground level, it is clearly visible once inside the houses on Fitzroy Square, projecting higher than any other building on the western side.

6.5 The sight lines at No 25 Fitzroy Square are marked on the plans (6.5 section B-B) these sectional views are totally inaccurate. The proposed roof height will adversely affect all the houses on the western side of the square and are considered not only unreasonable but unacceptable, having an adverse impact.
Ref. to No 25 Fitzroy Square is comprised of 5 residential flats.
The basement and ground floor habitable areas will lose the most sunlight and daylight and this will impact negatively on residents quality of life. The flats will take on a gloomy feel as will the 1st, 2nd and 3rd floors being compromised with less sunlight and overlooking. The studio flat 25E, is in closer proximity to Glebe House and has roof windows. These will be overlooked including their bathroom/WC.
Photographs showing sight lines from habitable ground floor living areas are available to support this objection.

The Fitzroy Mews houses adjoining the rear of Fitzroy Square Western Terrace in this quiet narrow cobbled street will also be adversely affected, not only by loss of light but the scale and proportion of the proposed development will be overwhelming.

8.0 Summary

In total disagreement with the applicants statement:

8.1 - 1-extended 6th floor is not inappropriate as it does not interrupt the uniform terrace to Cleveland Street. Disagree. IT IS HIGHER THAN ANY OTHER BUILDING. It is prominent within the street scenes, impacts adversely on Fitzroy Mews and the Western Terrace of Fitzroy Square.

8.2 'Improvements to the visual rhythm and at ground level to the rear will provide enhancement to both Cleveland Street and Fitzroy Mews'. Disagree for the reasons given above. It will also adversely impact on the Fitzroy Square Conservation Area and the Western Terrace.

8.4 All this non reversible and controversial development is for just one additional family sized dwelling, hardly adding to the housing stock and offers no significant benefit to anyone but the applicant, while the nearby properties affected by loss of amenity will inevitably experience the value of their properties significantly reduced.

In conclusion

If this development is allowed to go ahead, the applicants proposals will detrimentally impact the quality of life and the mental health for many people with loss of sunlight and daylight in their homes. The Fitzroy Square Conservation Area will be irreversibly damaged.

Please acknowledge receipt of this letter and inform me of what steps you intend to take in response to my objections. I should welcome the opportunity to discuss further and happy for you to inspect from my flat the overlooking aspect and potential loss of sunlight and daylight.

Printed on: 17/06/2021 09:10:13

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				Yours sincerely, Kitty Edwards-Jones (Director for and on behalf of 25 Fitzroy Square)
