

Application No:	Received:	Comment:	Response:						
2013/6025/P	28/10/2013 19:22:40	OBJ	<p>As a resident of the London Borough of Camden and owner of a property in Anglers Lane I object to this planning application on the following grounds</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of planning foresight 2. Poor design <p>Lack of planning foresight With the increasing age of the population in the need for dementia care, as takes place at Raglan Street, is likely to increase. It is therefore short sighted to merely replace one centre with another. This flies in the face of the GLA policy 3.16 which seeks to protect and ENHANCE social infrastructure</p> <p>Poor design</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) 3 of the flats do not meet Camden's own guidelines (CGP 2 Housing) for minimum floor space, i.e <table data-bbox="1093 448 1765 539"> <tr> <td>Flat A (1B2P)</td> <td>proposed= 45sqm</td> <td>standard =48sqm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Flats D & E (2B4P)</td> <td>proposed =70sqm</td> <td>standard=75sqm</td> </tr> </table> b) The proposed new balcony is out of keeping with the rest of the building and appears to cast a shadow over the ground floor windows thus reducing the light to these flats. 	Flat A (1B2P)	proposed= 45sqm	standard =48sqm	Flats D & E (2B4P)	proposed =70sqm	standard=75sqm
Flat A (1B2P)	proposed= 45sqm	standard =48sqm							
Flats D & E (2B4P)	proposed =70sqm	standard=75sqm							
2013/6025/P	29/10/2013 21:08:46	OBJ	<p>As residents of what has historically been a very quiet, residential street in what is in part a conservation area we are extremely concerned about the proposed redevelopment of 1 Raglan Street from a daycare centre into a block of flats. Our concerns are threefold:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Excessive noise/ disturbance from the creation of the large external roof terrace, in what is a very quiet neighbourhood 2. Pressure on parking. We are concerned the application does not address whether or not the residents will have parking rights. Raglan street is already heavily oversubscribed, particularly at weekends when shoppers on the high road use it for parking 3. Subsequent planning applications to develop the property which may result in a significant alteration to the fundamental characteristics of the area. <p>We are also concerned about the impact of the development works, in light of the negative impact on our day to day lives when Lakehouse used the space opposite our house as their depot, resulting in daily disturbance from workers and trucks from 6.30am daily.</p>						

Application No:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2013/6025/P	25/10/2013 11:22:19	OBJ	<p>I regret the closure of the day centre, and would prefer to see this building maintained in a similar Class D1 use. Has this been explored properly by the Council? Would such information, and clear information about the process of such exploration, not be relevant to such an application?</p> <p>If genuine attempts have been made to find a continuing D1 use for this building, and have failed, then perhaps I could have no objection to this change of use in principle.</p> <p>I object to the current proposals, however, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The loss of the conservatory causes concern, since if this resultant raised open space is to be used communally by all residents as 'private amenity space' there is a risk of prominent noisy or unsociable behaviour at evenings and weekends, which would compromise the amenity of this quiet area currently enjoyed by residents. This would also result in a significant loss of privacy and amenity to the house opposite, at 1A Anglers Lane. 2. The details of the proposals are not sympathetic to the attractive original design and fabric of this elegant building, which is of high quality and amenity value in terms of its own original architectural detailing. The proposed use of uPVC windows, for instance, is entirely inappropriate, and should be prevented - particularly in the context of the Inkerman Conservation Area, to which this building visually relates, even if not located strictly within its bounds. 3. Too much is being shoehorned into this building in these current proposals, resulting in an awkward internal layout at odds with the spaces within this classically balanced building. The interior spaces could be much better and more attractively planned, and relate more comfortably to the existing fenestration, if fewer flats were proposed as part of an improved scheme more sympathetic to this attractive building.
2013/6025/P	28/10/2013 19:20:00	COMMNT	<p>details were not posted online until 21 October thus reducing the time available for the wider community to view these proposals.</p>
2013/6025/P	30/10/2013 15:19:15	OBJ	<p>We've been residents of a quiet residential street in The Inkerman Conservation area for 49 years. We are concerned about the proposed redevelopment of 1 Raglan Street from a care centre into a block of flats.</p> <p>Please find following our concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise/ disturbance from the creation of the large external roof terrace 2. Pressure on parking. 3. Subsequent planning applications to develop the property which may result in a significant alteration to the fundamental characteristics of the area.