

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5104/P	giovanni ceretti	10/12/2021 19:50:52	OBJ	<p>My name is Giovanni Ceretti and I am the owner of Flat 1, Ventana Court, (also known as Latchfords Yard), 61A Endell Street. I am writing to strongly object to recently submitted planning application numbered 2021/5104/P.</p> <p>At the time of writing, it is not clear to me if, in advance of a formal application being submitted, this application had been previously discussed with your office and had been provided with an indication of future acceptance; however, it takes very little scrutiny to realise that this application and planned works are very detrimental to the Latchfords Yard.</p> <p>As you may know, this property sits in the both the Covent Garden Conservation area and Seven Dials area. It is my understanding that Latchfords Yard was redeveloped only twenty years ago when clear planning directives were already in place, directives which I guess are still very similar today, and that have been applied to this development to preserve its original layout and discretion. At that time of that development, the goal of the planners was to make sure that the area was going to retain the layout and height of the historical site, hence the planners were obliged to tone down the original request of the developers and limit the height of the buildings.</p> <p>There are many issues that I could highlight to contest the appropriateness of this project, however, I am sure that you will be receiving multiple complaints from other neighbours who will only write lengthier, more comprehensive messages. Therefore, I will only name two key objections which in my opinion disqualify this project from the outset:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) Latchfords Yard is particularly narrow and for the most part enjoy limited levels of natural light. The erection of a further floor in addition to a terrace, as per the planning application, will further limit the yard's access to natural light which will affect all of the north and east facing windows which look onto the yard. Of course the new elevation will offer a great improvement in lighting to the applicant's property but all this to the detriment of the quality of life of all the other residents in the Yard. In my eyes, this is akin to stealing at another's expense.</li><li>2) This proposal will set an ugly precedent, whereby I do not see how future development applications of other Latchford Yard's properties looking to develop in the same manner should or will ever be stopped by your office. The consequence of this will be that nothing will remain of the atmosphere of the original timber yard and the principles originally applied by your office on the latest development will be overruled.</li></ol> <p>In responding to this application, your office must decide if it intends to preserve the dimensions and the roof lines of the original timber yard as approved in that spirit twenty years ago.</p> <p>Needless to say that this is nothing else than an opportunistic and eyesore-like development that hinges on erasing the atmosphere of the old well-conserved yard while at the same time dramatically impacting the quality of life of all the other residents, present and future. We all had previously expressed our disappointment to the applicant who has dismissed all our concerns.</p> <p>Your sincerely</p> <p>Giovanni Ceretti</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5104/P	Joan Copeman	10/12/2021 16:41:55	OBJNOT	<p>My name is Joan Copeman and I am the owner of Flat 2 Ventana Court (sometimes known as Latchfords Yard), 61a Endell Street, WC2H 9AJ. My husband, Peter Copeman, and I wish to notify you of our objection to the planning application for Flat 5, Ventana Court.</p> <p>Firstly, it is important to understand the nature of Ventana Court/Latchfords Yard. I have owned my property since the original development twenty years ago. It is in the style of a courtyard on the site of the old Latchfords Yard timber yard. There are 5 properties on the site, owned separately, but the community of owners share ownership and responsibility for the common areas, including the passageway into the courtyard from Endell Street and the courtyard itself in front of the 5 properties. This joint ownership is effected through a management company known as Latchfords Yard Limited, with all 5 owners being members of this company. Latchfords Yard Limited is also responsible for the maintenance of the external walls and roof of all the buildings, and the 5 owners (under the terms of ownership) share equally in the costs for this and the insurance of the buildings.</p> <p>It has always been our understanding that works on behalf of any of the 5 properties affecting the common areas and those requiring alterations to the external building would require the consent of Latchfords Yard Limited. To our knowledge this has only happened once before, in 2012/13 when the owners of Flat 5 (who are also the current owners) proposed significant alterations to the interior of their property and some much less significant changes to the layout of the same roof terrace that would now be affected again by the proposed works. No objections were made at the time by other owners, on the basis that the external element was not perceived to have a significant impact on them or Latchfords Yard as a whole.</p> <p>We understand that all the owners of the properties other than Flat 5 will, for good reasons, object to the new proposals, and therefore presume that Latchfords Yard Limited will not grant approval to the proposed works. The proposed changes to Flat 5 would have a much more significant impact on the other properties than the previous alterations. They would effectively result in a new room being built on the area of the roof terrace, with a new roof terrace above this. Raising the height of this part of the building by one storey would have a significant detrimental impact on the amount of light entering the courtyard. Such light is already quite limited, as was a consideration when the original development was approved twenty years ago. The part of the sky that would be blocked out is precisely the area that is seen straight ahead when entering the courtyard from the enclosed passageway from the street. The new room would also reduce the light to and directly overlook a bedroom of Flat 4, and produce more noise from above for the main bedroom of Flat 3, which is directly below.</p> <p>The nature of the courtyard development is a major attractive feature for all the owners, and we believe that raising the height and thereby further enclosing the surrounding buildings will have a significant negative impact on the appearance and feel of the courtyard, and indeed on the value of our property. The current design works well, and we wish to maintain it in its current form.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5104/P	giovanni ceretti	10/12/2021 19:47:58	OBJ	<p>My name is Giovanni Ceretti and I am the owner of Flat 1, Ventana Court, (also known as Latchfords Yard), 61A Endell Street. I am writing to strongly object to recently submitted planning application numbered 2021/5104/P.</p> <p>At the time of writing, it is not clear to me if, in advance of a formal application being submitted, this application had been previously discussed with your office and had been provided with an indication of future acceptance; however, it takes very little scrutiny to realise that this application and planned works are very detrimental to the Latchfords Yard.</p> <p>As you may know, this property sits in the both the Covent Garden Conservation area and Seven Dials area. It is my understanding that Latchfords Yard was redeveloped only twenty years ago when clear planning directives were already in place, directives which I guess are still very similar today, and that have been applied to this development to preserve its original layout and discretion. At that time of that development, the goal of the planners was to make sure that the area was going to retain the layout and height of the historical site, hence the planners were obliged to tone down the original request of the developers and limit the height of the buildings.</p> <p>There are many issues that I could highlight to contest the appropriateness of this project, however, I am sure that you will be receiving multiple complaints from other neighbours who will only write lengthier, more comprehensive messages. Therefore, I will only name two key objections which in my opinion disqualify this project from the outset:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) Latchfords Yard is particularly narrow and for the most part enjoy limited levels of natural light. The erection of a further floor in addition to a terrace, as per the planning application, will further limit the yard's access to natural light which will affect all of the north and east facing windows which look onto the yard. Of course the new elevation will offer a great improvement in lighting to the applicant's property but all this to the detriment of the quality of life of all the other residents in the Yard. In my eyes, this is akin to stealing at another's expense.</li><li>2) This proposal will set an ugly precedent, whereby I do not see how future development applications of other Latchford Yard's properties looking to develop in the same manner should or will ever be stopped by your office. The consequence of this will be that nothing will remain of the atmosphere of the original timber yard and the principles originally applied by your office on the latest development will be overruled.</li></ol> <p>In responding to this application, your office must decide if it intends to preserve the dimensions and the roof lines of the original timber yard as approved in that spirit twenty years ago.</p> <p>Needless to say that this is nothing else than an opportunistic and eyesore-like development that hinges on erasing the atmosphere of the old well-conserved yard while at the same time dramatically impacting the quality of life of all the other residents, present and future. We all had previously expressed our disappointment to the applicant who has dismissed all our concerns.</p> <p>Your sincerely</p> <p>Giovanni Ceretti</p>