OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 2023/1201/P RE, 81-84 CHALK FARM ROAD.

I am writing to express my very strong objections to the proposals as set out in Planning Application 2023/1201/P re, 81-84 Chalk Farm Road.

Farm Road development, within which the application site sits. My objection is that the proposals are unneighbourly. That they do not respect and respond to the immediate context of the site which is a residential development. And that the result of this is that there will be a significant negative impact upon the residential amenity. This impact will be felt in terms of noise and disturbance from the comings and goings of building users and the additional floor, which will feel dominant and overbearing given the compact courtyard setting.

Comings and Goings In Conflict With Residential Context

The application site is surrounded by residential uses on all sides and is accessed via the 85-86 Chalk Farm Road development (1). The access is through the lower end of a courtyard space that wraps around the application site (2). There is deep concern that the comings and goings of the building users through this space and the proposed 'spill out' activities will create noise and disturbance at the expense of the amenity of the residents.

There is also concern that the messaging of an outward facing building with a 'distinctive' façade (8), intended to attract attention, and an aspiration to be seen as part of The Roundhouse, invites yet more pedestrian traffic into the courtyard and people who understand the space to be part of the public realm and then behave accordingly, which is in conflict with protecting the residential amenity.

The courtyard space is highly reverberant, and it is a characteristic of this space that normal speaking conversations held in one part can be heard clearly in another. As I understand it, the footprint, the relative height of the walls and the hard surfaces, come together to reflect the sound so it 'bounces' round the space and gets amplified. Increased activity in this space is highly undesirable.

There have already been some instances of disturbance to the residents by the current users of the building, hanging out chatting and smoking/vaping in the yard and at the entranceway. There is concern that this and the general traffic in and out, will only increase with the proposed increased capacity from the additional floor: a 30% increase in space bringing a 30% increase in disturbance.

At the same time, there is no clear justification for the need for the additional space.

Hustle and bustle in the courtyard space is also undesirable as it makes the management of the gated entrance very challenging. This is a cause of deep concern in terms of protecting the safety and security of the residents. In the past, when the gated entrance has not been effectively managed, the courtyard space has been subject to unwelcome visitors drinking, urinating, defecating, vomiting; there has been vandalism, theft of property and threats to the personal safety of the residents.

Proposals For The Additional Floor Conflict With Residential Amenity

The site sits within a courtyard space which is a highly valued residential amenity for occupiers of 85 – 86 Chalk Farm Road. The space provides a much needed and quieter contrast to the vibrant and very noisy main road, a 'rear garden' experience (Slide 3). This is important for the both the occupants of 1-14 Stockholm Apartments, as their properties face onto Chalk Farm Road, and those of 1-3 Nordic Mews, whose principal outlook is the courtyard space. To the rear, the Mews hoses are back to back with the neighbouring properties (3).

Integral to the 'rear garden' experience is the relatively neutral exterior of the application site building and the proportions of the courtyard space, which together provide some calm and the sense of a breathing space within the bustle of the city.

There is deep concern that this will be irrevocably damaged by the additional floor, which as proposed, risks dominating the tight space and generating an uncomfortable sense of enclosure. At the same time the proposals to make the building more 'distinctive', ie noticeable, run the risk of making it feel even more overbearing (4, 8, 9).

1-3 Nordic Mews is only 12 metres away from the western façade at its narrowest point and it is here that it is proposed to locate the 'main bulk' of the additional floor. There is deep concern that the proposal to just vertically extrude the west side wall, in the same plane as the existing wall, for a full floor height, circa 3-4 metres, for the entire length, circa 19-20 metres, will create a cliff experience at ground level and that the visual bulk will block a significant portion of the sky (4, 6, 7,8). 1-14 Stockholm Apartments at only 8 metres away at the narrowest point, and here it is opposite corner of the application site, at the corner, the 'main bulk' of the floor will be very present and visually intrusive (4, 5).

There is concern that the proposed large and protruding windows and dramatic external finishes will give the feeling of being overlooked and feel very dominant in the small scale of the space and that this is very much to the detriment of the residential amenity of its neighbours (4, 9).

It is accepted that the owners of the application site might seek to enhance the value of their building by both the additional of extra floorspace and to create a 'look' for the building that matches their 'brand'. It is felt, however, that the present proposals do so, at the expense of and to the detriment of the residential amenity of the immediate neighbours to the south and west of the site.



















