From: Sofie Fieldsend

Sent: 17 December 2021 11:01
To: Planning Planning

Subject: FW: Application Number 2021/4294/P

Attachments: 18 Greville St Objection.pdf; ATT00001.htm; Mackay Partners Drg.pdf;

ATT00002.htm

Hello,

Can you upload their objection please?

Thanks,

Sofie

From: Mark Newland-Smith Sent: 15 December 2021 17:26

To: Sofie Fieldsend

Subject: Application Number 2021/4294/P

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Sophie,

Please find attached a letter of objection and supporting drawing in relation to the above application.

I have assumed that your e-mail address is the same format as others at Camden but perhaps you would be kind enough to confirm receipt.

Regards,

Mark

Mark Newland-Smith

Urbanomics Ltd



15.12.21

Camden Planning and Development

Dear Ms Fieldsend,

Application Number 2021/4294/P 18 Greville Street

I am writing on behalf of the owner application.

Our client did not object to the similar but smaller scheme on this site, which was granted planning consent in 2008, but feels that this latest application is going to have too great an impact.

Looking at the documents associated with this application I have read your own Preapplication advice, with which I am sure you are familiar but just for the record it states under Design and Heritage that:

"The rear extensions combined in terms of their scale and bulk would not be supported as they dominate the rear elevation and you are advised to reduce them down to the scale proposed in the 2008 to ensure that the extensions are subordinate and respect the building and wider area."

And concludes that:

"It is considered that the rear extensions, in their current form and scale would harm the character and appearance of the host property, terrace and Hatton Garden conservation area. This element in its current form would not be seen favourably at application stage by officers"

I do not think there is any point in quoting all of the relevant polices that would support rejecting this application, as these are well recorded in your own report. I would simple urge you and your fellow officers to be robust in defending the position that you have previously set out.

Of specific concern to my client is the fact that the applicants have not limited the size of development to that in the 2008 application. The extension as now proposed would project past the roof terraces on the second and third floors at the rear of 19 Greville Street. Also the applicant has erroneously shown a second floor window on my client's building where there is actually a door.

I attach a drawing that our client has had produced which shows the windows and door more accurately and the overlap of the proposed building.

Whilst I appreciate that my client's accommodation is not residential units and therefore the occupants' rights to light are legislatively limited, I would urge you to take regard of the fact that even the small amount of light afforded by the windows in my clients building is of value in the enjoyment of the working environment. The rooms affected by the development do not have any other windows and it is likely that the reliance on artificial light will be greatly increased if the development were to go ahead as planned. The bulk of the proposed development within what is already a very tight historic courtyard will change its character entirely and my client's view is that consent should not be granted for any development larger than that already consented.

Yours sincerely,

Mark Newland-Smith

