

Flat O College House
Finchley Road
London
NW3 5ES
Ms CG Knights



To whom it may concern,

Flat O College House, NW3 5ES strongly objects to the proposed planning permission with the application number 2022/5568/P.

The Community Involvement for this development has been poor. A flyer distributed to 858 addresses informing them and inviting them to visit the consultation website to provide feedback through an online survey is disappointing, demonstrated by the fact that there were only 2 responses online and that NO leaflets were distributed to residence of College House- one of the residential blocks affected.

Therefore, following a review of the submitted information our main reasons for objecting are as below:

Loss of light and the height of the development.

I strongly object to the height of the building and question the DAYLIGHT & SUNLIGHT REPORT as it is ridiculously inaccurate, specifically for my property within College House, directly adjacent to the proposed development. How such a report can comment on my windows and room use when they were provided with only partial layout information and have never visited my property.

The biggest error is the under representation of the number of rooms and windows which will be affected by the reduction of daylight for College House as the report states College House has 2-storeys from first floor to second floor, with 11 windows serving 5 habitable rooms – My property itself has 5 windows and 2 doors, serving 3 rooms, so how there can only be 11 windows in total is alarming. This is nothing more than a ruthless plan to underestimate the windows affected by the development to make the report's conclusion palatable to Camden's Planning department.

From the DAYLIGHT & SUNLIGHT REPORT:

- '8.16 The isolated, more significant impact to 1 window (W2/201) is largely due to its location on the flank return of the first-floor massing and its aspect towards the flank wall of the Proposed Development. Nevertheless, this secondary flank wall window serves a dual aspect bedroom (R2/201) in which the principal window (W3/201) remains fully BRE compliant. The large size of both windows and dual aspect nature of the bedroom will ensure that over half of the bedroom will maintain a good level of daylight distribution, as measured by NSL'- This is incorrect, as (W2/201) is our

principal window, letting in the majority of light and provides the most privacy as W3/201) is overlooked by neighbours of College Crescent.

- The loss of light from (W3/201) reported to be 6.49% is laughable and my other window W1/201 is not even mentioned in the findings and too will be go into darkness significantly above the 90.32%.
- 'With regards to sunlight, none of the site-facing living rooms assessed have a window orientated within 90° due south. Therefore, the apartment blocks are not eligible for sunlight assessment' – again incorrect!!! The setting sun does enter our bedroom through window (W2/201) and terrace as it descends in the west. Window (W1/201) and (W3/201) also benefit from an additional bonus of sunlight reflecting off the windows from the College Crescent building, which if the development went ahead would no longer happen – a natural factor of light which is not mentioned within the report but plays a substantial role in lighting up my rooms.

If such mistakes have been made in the report for my own property, I fathom to guess the additional inaccuracies within the report and would seriously question how such a report can be relied upon to approve the planning permission.

My home will be engulfed by the new building severely affecting light within my rooms. The proposed height of the building will forever cast a shadow in 50% of my flat (2 out of my 4 habitable rooms) and will prevent the evening/setting sun from shining into my rooms and onto our terrace. This reduction in natural light will make the flat more reliable on electric lighting, increasing the flats carbon footprint and electricity bills.

For the report to conclude my right to light is 'considered an unavoidable isolated incidence' is disgusting. My right to light should not be sacrificed for financial gain as the proposed plan focuses on a hotel with 44 rooms.

Such a development will certainly not help Camden build new homes for the community and approval of this development will confirm Camden has no consideration for our right to light and the impact a forever dark home will have on my family's health and wellbeing.

Loss of privacy and noise from new uses

The proposed plans show that the windows on the northeast side of the building and the terrace on 5th floor will have a view of my terrace overlooking my outside space and a clear view of my College Crescent neighbours rooms.

The huge number of floors and windows would mean I would no longer be able to enjoy my outside space as I would fear that a paedophile or an undesirable person would be watching my young children play outside as they stay in the hotel.

With a school playground (University College School Pre-Prep) close to the development, I assume anyone wishing to buy or rent on the sex offenders list will be denied but how is this policed in a hotel?

The hotel patrons will also increase the noise our home and neighbours are subject to. With no allocated parking, adequate stopping facilities on Finchley Road, windows overlooking my outdoor space, the hotel rooms lining my property wall, and the entrance being beside my front window its without doubt that additional noise will be heard from the guests/staff themselves and the additional road traffic.

This noise will remain and will continue throughout the night and into the early hours of the morning as unlike the commercial shops, which currently close at night, the hotel will not close?

Therefore, approval of this development infringes on my right for privacy, poses a safeguarding risk for my children and that of the neighbouring school and will have a negative affect on noise to the neighbouring properties.

Noise, pollution, and nuisance from the development equipment

Finchley Road is an extremely busy road with a busy footpath. This development will cause havoc with the flow of traffic and cause pedestrians to use alternative routes during the building phase.

The noise of the development is also a huge concern. The continuous drone of the equipment and noise of workers will affect my day and that of my neighbours along with the children University College School Pre-Prep - 36 College Crescent. NW3 5LF

With the height of the building, the prep school's playground would be seen by many, but the air quality report fails to note the Pre school as a Human receptor – how is this possible? This schools playground backs onto the development site and will be affected by the development.

The height of the property will also contribute to pollution from the road being retained, becoming greater concentrated during peak rush hour timings.

Traffic parking and road safety

Finchley simple does not have sufficient provisions for the proposed plans. Apart, from loading and unloading within restricted hours of the day, there is no where for guests arriving to the hotel to park or safely stop.

Finchley Road is extremely busy as it is, and the introduction of this hotel will only add to this problem as its likely many will arrive by road as Finchley Road station and Swiss cottage do not have a lift for accessible access.

Impact of the build and loss of land

The proposed plans see the land at the back of the current property to be reduced by building on it. This land when aloud to grow (which I admire from my window (W2/201) and my terrace) has seasonal shrubs and flowers which attract pollinating insects, birds, squirrels, foxes, and hedgehogs. Wildlife and plants will be severely affected by the development along

with the fox who uses this area to access the den which is under my terrace. Development of this building will see the fox trapped as their access will be blocked.

To conclude Flat O College House objects to the plans for application number **2022/5568/P** due to the impact on the land, loss of light, loss of privacy, noise, pollution, and nuisance to Flat O and its surrounding neighbours.

I thank you for the opportunity to comment and welcome a visit from the planning department to discuss the severity this proposal has on my flat and my surrounding neighbours.