

Our Ref: OCO1/2
Your Ref: 2022/1298/P

28th May 2022

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



HLF PLANNING LTD
First Floor Office
172 Old Christchurch Road
Bournemouth
BH1 1NU

Dear Sirs

RE: 60 Charlotte Street - Objection to 2022/1298/P

We have been instructed [REDACTED] to assess the current application at 60 Charlotte Street for use of the top floor as a new terrace with significant building work to erect screening, an increased stairwell and raised terrace. Having considered the proposal and adopted policies of the Local Development Plan, we write to object on his behalf.

The submitted plans and Design and Access Statement (DAS) are not clear as to what the existing situation is and the level of development proposed. For example the DAS repeats a 3D model image of the proposal but fails to show what is there as existing.

The proposal includes a raised terrace over the existing lift overrun at the front of the building, which from the photographs supplied appears to be a full storey high. This would then be bordered by balustrading to match the existing (although it is pointed out that the existing balustrade needs to be heightened to meet building regulation standards of 1.10m). To the rear of the building the stairwell would be extended and flanked by two privacy screens.

The visual impact of this cannot be fully appreciated without clear existing levels and elevations to compare against. However, on face value the development would effectively enclose the central part of the roof with full height walls and doors, leaving a circular space around this core for people to congregate and enjoy uninterrupted views down into the neighbouring residential streets.

To the northeast the relationship with the existing neighbouring dwelling has been addressed using tall privacy screens, that flank the addition to extend the stairwell. This would create a sense of enclosure for neighbours and also present 60 Charlotte Street as being a full storey higher.

The purpose of the terrace is unclear. The building already has permission for the use of the much larger roof space below as a terrace and the area being created does not represent the “valuable outdoor amenity space, which will enhance wellbeing and increase urban greening in the area” as claimed in the DAS. The proposal would result in an additional storey being built on this building under the premise of facilitating amenity space and greening. The amenity space that is not needed due to an abundance of such uses at the building and a token level of urban greening that does little to justify the levels of development, particularly within a Conservation Area.

Turning to matters of heritage, the NPPF makes clear that:

“In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets’ importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary.”

The application is not supported by a heritage statement and only makes a passing reference to the conservation area. The DAS also incorrectly states that the nearest Listed Building is 1 Scala Street, ignoring the listed buildings directly adjacent at 24, 26, 28 and 30 Tottenham Road. The setting of these buildings in particular have the potential to be affected through an additional storey being built opposite.

The latest design greatly increases the central area and what was previously considered to be a discrete addition to the building would effectively have the same impact on openness and character that an additional storey would have. The previous approval was also conditioned to prevent use outside of standard office hours and whilst the application form states that hours of operation are not applicable for this proposal that is clearly not the case.

The proposal fails to provide sufficient information for a full consideration of the planning merits. The lack of interest in addressing the heritage impacts is contrary to the NPPF and 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 and refuse the application.

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

Yours faithfully



HLF Planning Ltd

