

Dear Ms Litherland

**Planning Application 2 Ref 2013/8265/P (Consultation Expiry Date 6th February 2014).
Previous Planning Application 2013/4867/P Withdrawn prior to Decision
Development of Bewlay House, 32 Jamestown Road, London NW1 7BY**

I am responding on behalf of the Iceworks Residents' Management Company as a number of concerns and objections have arisen and as matters raised in relation to the first application have not been addressed in this recent resubmission. As you will recall, a number of potentially misleading matters contained in the application was brought to your attention by phone last Wednesday and you intended to talk to the Applicant's Agent. As there has been no feedback and the deadline is now upon us the concerns discussed, and more, are stated below.

1. Additional Height - Roof Extensions

We note that the applicant proposes only a small reduction in the height of the top floor roof extension by 0.6 metres but has not addressed specifically the building height in relation to the Iceworks and the height of the proposed new plant installations, ventilations, lift vents and the rooftop solar thermal and/or solar photo voltaic panels extending above the height of the neighbouring Iceworks building and the Holiday Inn. The DAS Drawings 51 to 60 reveal that the proposed top floor and parapet would in itself still exceed way above the Iceworks and the Holiday Inn. In addition, the roof top plant and the walls of solar panels on frames (presumably several metres high) appear to also stretch even further above the proposed roof extension and the neighbouring buildings and this would not be acceptable. We can find no indication that these panels would be laid flat into the roof itself and therefore will increase the overall height.

The applicant provides no proper CGI pictures showing the full visual impact the solar panels will have from various vantage points and from other levels of residential properties and businesses in the vicinity. The drawings provided are somewhat misleading as they show the existence of the solar panels in very faint print as if to portray them as insignificant. As stated in response to the previous applications, LBC also has great concerns about the height of the proposed build. The solar panels would appear to make matters worse. Heights of buildings in this conservation and residential area should be respected. Previous objections to rooftop extensions relating to the Henson Building should, as a matter of principle, still apply, and we therefore would object to any relaxation of the rules concerning rooftop extensions and height of buildings and plant.

2. Canal side facade, Street side facade and Balconies

The application fails to identify the proposals for the vertical extension for the canal side facade. We therefore continue to object to any plan which moves the canal side facade and associated outside spaces projecting out any further than the existing building facade line and to any balconies and outside spaces protruding out and overhanging the canal which will create misalignment on this group of buildings.

The existing Bewlay House canal side facade extends out approx 10cm from the Iceworks building which abuts it and we object to any further extension outwards on existing amenity grounds for the Iceworks residents at canal side. We would seek a planning condition and written formal confirmation from the developer that any future alterations to this site would not alter the existing canal side situation in relation to the Iceworks building and this remains a great concern of residents.

Item 7.46 in the application states there will be a small vertical extension of 0.95 metre at the Jamestown Road facade which appears to bring the proposed building exterior right up to the inner pavement and where the pavement is quite narrow and footfall high. We assume that appropriate

doors will be installed and set back as doors opening outwards onto the pavement will interfere with pedestrians' right of way.

We note that, except for a minor amendment to remove the third floor balcony to accommodate a privacy request from the Holiday Inn, the proposal is to retain the two balconies at 1st and 2nd floor levels. These remaining protruding balconies (intended for the offices' use) will misalign the current straight facade and sight line which goes against canal side vistas and should be deemed unnecessary to the overall design especially as there is already, included in the a proposal, a huge terrace for office occupiers at Ground Floor Reception level canal side and a large roof terrace at 4th Floor level Jamestown Road side with lift access.

Setting back at 4th and 5th Floors – we note that the applicant has been in contact with only the Freeholder about privacy, security and acoustic screens for the proposed 4th and 5th Floors terraces and where privacy, access and security is deemed a matter requiring a planning condition.

3. Design and Effect within the Conservation Area

Apart from the minor change in colour of brick work, the objections detailed in the response to the first application still apply. We note that the austere all dark grey brick proposed in the first application has been changed to a red brick mix and this is an improvement, however, the large window openings remain the same size on the canal side and still outsize any of those in the surrounding buildings, (especially at first floor level and above). While this size of window may be in keeping with the Jamestown Road streetscape of offices they do not preserve or add to the historic and mercantile tradition of the canal side and we would submit therefore that this does not constitute 'good design' in this canal side conservation environment. The massive windows and proposed remaining 2 balconies (and if any misaligning extension is planned) then this would fail to relate successfully to neighbouring properties canal side within the conservation area. We would also welcome the opportunity to see samples of the colours incorporated in the red mix of bricks proposed.

4. Mixed Use to C3 Residential and B1 Office or Retaining sole B1 use

4.1 Housing element

The resubmission application for the housing element appears unchanged and therefore we reiterate the points made in September 2013.

Jamestown Road is not in a designated growth area for housing. While it is in a 'highly accessible' area there has already been recent significant intensive housing (and retail development) on this road and the canal side vicinity and this housing proposal merely adds to the overdevelopment and stresses on facilities and therefore further intensification of housing would be unjustified.

The Council's housing strategy states the key fact about the housing in Camden is that 'home ownership and private renting of all but the cheapest homes are prohibitively expensive even for households with incomes that match the average across the borough'.

The claim that these apartments will not be bought by buy to let purchasers (often off plan) is totally unfounded and flies in the face of what is actually happening in London and Camden at present. Types of developments with predominantly one and two beds with no parking provision will only encourage higher market rents and corporate renters who do not tend to get rooted in the community as is claimed and will be socially exclusive. This proposal will not contribute to the aspirations for a mixed community nor attract people from the local community.

Of the proposed units 44% are one bed private dwellings. We believe that this % is above that normally permitted for one bed development and we would oppose this. In addition, the Henson Building opposite already has approx 39% one bed dwellings and there is a range of one bed flats in Gilbey House as well as other buildings in the area. DP5 states that there is an over representation of small dwellings in the borough already so there is no recognised need or reason to support this type of residential offer. We note that this high proportion of one bed units is at the expense of larger units as only 2 x 3 bed Family residential units are proposed.

1.7 of the Council's core strategy says that on the basis of past trends the Council is on target to achieve the building of 815 homes per year between 2010/2011 and 2024/2025 which comfortably exceeds Camden's current growth plan target of 595 homes between 2007 and 2017. As the Council also states 'This means we can comfortably meet our housing targets even if some identified sites do not come forward for development as envisaged'. These targets also exceed the Mayor's expectations.

The above residential offer and the applicants claim that affordable housing cannot be supported in such a small number merely supports their return on investment.

We would contend then that, as there are building height and other contentious issues which have not been addressed, and as the proposals do not serve any key housing criteria, then refusing the residential element would not damage the target achievement and the Council's development plans.

Rather, more employment space within the building could be created and should be the priority and particularly since claims that were made in the first application about space and jobs creation have reduced significantly - see below. We would ask that the Council's core strategy on Managing Growth be applied rigorously to this application in order to reject the housing element in favour of more and sole employment space.

4.2 Sole B1 Office Space and Employment

We note that the commercial tenants appear to still be in occupation at Bewlay House and did not vacate at the end of December 2013 as stated in both applications and therefore the existing building it seems is still in a satisfactory and lettable state.

We were also very alarmed to learn, and the Planning Officer has been made aware of this last week, that that claims made in the first application have changed significantly in this resubmission with regard to the increase in Net Internal Area (NIA) to be created and the New Jobs Forecast numbers despite there being no identifiable changes made to the proposed office space plans between the first to the second application and could have been easily overlooked. As this was surprisingly not highlighted as a significant change by the applicant we would urge the LPA to recheck all the measurements and numbers, particularly the lettable area, for accuracy, and as much of the GIA is taken up by basement plant, reception and atrium. In principle we would object to any loss of office space at this site.

In the original application at 7.13 we were led to believe that 941sq m NIA office space would be created which could potentially support 78 additional jobs.

This second application at 7.13 states that only 383 sq m NIA will be created resulting in only a *potential* increase of only 32 jobs (reduction of 558 NIA sq m and a reduction of 46 potential jobs).

This revelation adds further to the argument that the building should be protected and expanded for sole employment use to attract small and medium sized businesses to Camden Town and to increase jobs above the small number of potential jobs to be created (whilst also incorporating proper and

appropriate servicing and delivery facilities). While the proposed residential side would not meet housing needs in the borough and because the height of the proposed building is being objected to, the building, if refurbishment and expanded for sole office space could have a huge and more significant impact on the provision of more new jobs in Camden particularly in light of the poor potential job numbers predicted in this recent submission.

One of the Mayor's key factors for economic growth in London and the Council's employment plans is to retain and attract employment and Jamestown Road and Bewlay House remains an ideal location for businesses. The building has traditionally been used solely for employment. We can see no evidence why the building, if retained within its current building parameters, with some changes in design to make it more attractive and refurbished cleverly and sensitively into sole B1 high quality office space, with modernised plant which could retain a high BREEAM score, and with proper servicing and delivery arrangements (off street as the road is highly congested) and thus minimising the impact on neighbours and residents, why this in itself, would not be sufficient to meet the needs of the Council's aspirations for Camden Town and Jamestown Road. Providing a greater number of jobs and affordable workspaces in line with Policy CS8 will contribute to the local economy, success and vibrancy of Camden Town, it does not have to have a residential element to achieve this.

5. Parking, Servicing and Deliveries

As these issues have not been addressed by the applicant in relation to the earlier response the concerns are reiterated below. Some or all of these matters had also been raised by the Holiday Inn, Star Lizard and Gilbey House residents within their original responses in September.

We are most concerned that no provision is made for off street parking or servicing off street which will stress further the local amenities for existing residents and businesses. Council permissions for parking and servicing have already been approved for many blocks on Jamestown Road in recognition of need.

6.21 in the Mayor's plan states that parking in new developments should be minimal - it does not say 'no parking' in all cases. While the Council might 'expect' new planning applications to include no parking facilities a capped number of parking spaces can be acceptable, and, local circumstances will have mitigation worthy of consideration.

The introduction last year of new retail units and businesses at the Camden High Street end of Jamestown Road which have 'on street' deliveries and servicing (where the road narrows with parking opposite) has affected the traffic situation negatively and created a major pinch point particularly with the junction at Arlington Road when delivery and service vehicles are parked up. This causes traffic to back up as far as Oval Road and beyond. The applicant says that deliveries and servicing will continue 'on street' which is a retrograde step as there is a real opportunity to reduce stress levels by introducing on site servicing and deliveries space at this site. Pedestrians should not have to try to cross the road with more high sided vehicles blocking their views which creates more accidents. A large scale opening to a parking area (11 spaces) already exists and there is also direct access to the highway to facilitate this provision.

The claim that deliveries and servicing will be centralised will be unenforceable given that businesses are likely to vary in their size and business needs.

We note that no further traffic survey has been done to add to the findings on the one day survey on 11th June 2013 which as previously stated was inadequate and not representative of the situation in the vicinity and Jamestown Road during weekdays and weekends. The existing community should not be subsidising the new development's vehicle parking needs and we would urge the Council to

approve at least minimum capped car parking and for parking for servicing and deliveries on site to alleviate the congestion and safety on Jamestown Road.

6. Sun Light, Day Light and Right to Light

We note that no new technical survey has been done in support of this resubmission. The applicant states that test have only been done on properties they think are 'likely' to be affected which makes the assumptions flawed and the exercise limited on the impact on existing property .

The old survey shows only the effect of the increase in height of the proposed new roof top extensions on the Henson building and 2 of the houses opposite on Jamestown Road and result show there will be some light reduction to those properties if the application is approved. Residents and offices should not have to accept any reduction of light however small.

The applicant states that tests were not done on the effect of the build on the Iceworks or Star Lizard commercial building because of their position in relation to Bewlay House and that, because there is an oval external light well at the Iceworks Courtyard, the increase in height of the proposed build will not affect the light available to properties to the west. Neither does it appear that there have been any tests done on the east facing apartments t Gilbey House or the Glass House building and others on Jamestown Road. It is unclear as to testing done on the Interchange building.

Concerns were stated earlier about the height of the Solar Panels and for peace of mind we would ask the developer to do further light tests to confirm that the presumptions made on light levels are correct at the Iceworks, Gilbey House and other blocks in the area. We would ask any in any case that a condition be placed concerning our right (legal or otherwise) to enjoy the same light levels that exists at present. It is also unclear whether the light test done, used as its base point, the proposed roof height or the height of the intended walls of solar panels which are much taller than the roof level proposed, and could potentially change the results of the light tests significantly and negatively for residents.

7. Impact During and Post Construction – Noise, Vibration and Light Pollution

During Construction – we appreciate there would be additional disturbance during any work that takes place to neighbouring buildings and we would seek a planning condition and formal agreement on the construction plan and the Times of Work permitted during the week (8.30am to 5pm) and No work permitted at weekends in order to minimise disruption, noise and vibration, and impact on the lives of residents.

Transport and Travel Plan Construction Impact – as adjoining neighbours we would wish these to be made available to residents and business occupiers for works that may in the future take place at Bewlay House.

Post Construction – the applicant states that the occupiers at 34-36 Jamestown Road will be the group most likely to be affected by noise and vibration following construction we would seek a planning condition and formal agreement on these matters so we are no worse off than at present.

We note also that lifts and toilet blocks are to be installed at the wall side adjoining the Iceworks residential block and Star Lizard at every floor level and that plant facilities are to be relocated to the basement with some remaining on the roof. All this has a potential impact on noise and humming and vibration on Iceworks residential neighbours and we seek planning conditions and formal agreement for any future works at the site.

8. Ice Well at 34-36 Jamestown Road

We seek written formal reassurances again that any works undertaken shall have no negative effect on the Well.

9. Party Wall Act – as adjoining neighbour we would seek formal agreement under the party wall act following any planning consents and modifications to any refurbishment project that may in the future take place at Bewlay House.

10. Pre Application Consultation

The poor consultation from the applicant before the 1st application was detailed in our response in September 2013. Residents of the Iceworks and Gilbey House have not been invited to meet to discuss the impact of the proposals and does sadly show a scant regard for residents. An e-mail had been sent (24th Oct 2013) to the developer saying that a joint meeting with other residents of the Iceworks and neighbouring blocks would be useful but no response was received. Again, this is hardly meaningful pre-consultation with local residents in the spirit intended by the Localism Act. We would, however, welcome the opportunity to discuss matters with the Developer and the Planning Officers.

It is also unclear from the Council's Neighbour list whether, for example, all Henson residents and offices or the houses at 61 and 63 Jamestown Road and other residents on the road, Gilbey House, Glass House etc have been sent formal consultation letters by the Council about this development.

11. We shall be eliciting the support of our 3 Ward Councillors.

12. Conclusion

We submit that the alterations to the building and the change of use is unacceptable for the reasons specified above and in light of this we respectfully ask the Local Planning Authority to refuse consent to this second application.

Ms Elaine Mattison, Chair, on behalf of the Directors of the Iceworks Residents' Management Company, The Iceworks, 36 Jamestown Road, NW1 7BY. 6th February 2014