

Application No: 2013/1598/P
Site Address: University of London
Garden Halls and Cartwright
Gardens Open Space
London
WC1H 9FF - 9EF
Case Officer: Richard McEllistrum
Consultees Name: Ms Sarah McKenzie

Received: 15/05/2013 22:28:39
Comment: OBJ

Response:

I have just heard about this planning application and have read the detailed letter sent to you from Ms Debbie Radcliffe of 91 Judd Street, which I support in full.

This proposed development is entirely out of keeping with the environment and community of this area and not in the spirit of the London Borough of Camdens Local Development Framework: Development Policy 25: Conserving Camden's Heritage .

English Heritage's views on the development do not factor in the unique nature of the broader environment and community within which it is located and are not valid.

I would appreciate it if you could inform me when the next public meeting/planning is held at which this will be discussed.

Application No:	Site Address:	Case Officer:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:
2013/1598/P	University of London Garden Halls and Cartwright Gardens Open Space London WC1H 9FF - 9EF	Richard McEllistrum	Ms clarissa m palmer	23/05/2013 14:35:33	COMMNT

Response:

I am concerned that the increase in the height of the proposed buildings will adversely affect the natural light currently available to the residents of Sandwich House, Sandwich Street. I also regret the loss of perspective and distance in their outlook. The flats, in a densely populated part of London, are compact; the sense of space afforded by both the light and the view are of great value to residents in the upper levels of the block. I am also concerned with increased noise in a street that is remarkably quiet given its location, will traffic currently using Cartwright Gardens us Sandwich Street instead and there is talk of noise from extractors/air conditioning units etc that might be positioned on the rooftop.

Application No:	Site Address:	Case Officer:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:
2013/1598/P	University of London Garden Halls and Cartwright Gardens Open Space London WC1H 9FF - 9EF	Richard McEllistrum	Miss Deborah J A Radcliffe	15/05/2013 04:02:27	OBJ

Response:

I have already written a detailed response but wish to submit selected comments on line as well.

The development site lies within the Bloomsbury Conservation Area, one of London's distinctive heritage quarters, and the danger of destroying its unique setting is considerable.

The proposals do not comply with Camden's Local Development Framework (DP 25) as follows:

- The replacement building, due its colossal bulk, does not enhance the conservation area to an appreciably greater extent than the existing building.
- The most conspicuous existing element (the 14 storey 1960s tower) is being retained in its entirety – emphasizing the tower's current incongruity within a heritage streetscape
- The proposal for a 9 storey 'solid block' along the whole of the eastern side of Cartwright Gardens is totally unsympathetic within the context of the Georgian crescent opposite and the other early 19th century houses within the neighbouring streets.
- The proposed development, by virtue of its excessive bulk and height, will cause harm to the setting of a large number of listed buildings in the immediate vicinity.

One of the key dimensions of sustainability is protecting and enhancing our historic environment. [p7 of NPPF] What are the real benefits for the local community when weighed against the threat of an over-large scheme and the arrival of 187 more students in an already densely inhabited area of London?

The University is asking Camden for permission to demolish Canterbury Hall (a positive contributor to the conservation area) while retaining the 14 storey 1960s tower block that is NOT a positive contributor. This inconsistency of response to one of Camden's policy documents, which is intended to assist planning decisions within the borough, will set an unwelcome precedent.

The argument for a site's viability for redevelopment seems to be inappropriately overriding the policy context concerning conserving its heritage interest and that of its surroundings.

Application No:	Site Address:	Case Officer:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:
2013/1598/P	University of London Garden Halls and Cartwright Gardens Open Space London WC1H 9FF - 9EF	Richard McEllistrum	Mr Desmond P.O Kilcoyne	15/05/2013 23:29:35	OBJ

Response:

Part 2

- d. Access points to the central block: In addition to the entrances to the new terraced houses, the plans show three additional access points to the central block on Sandwich Street. One of them appears to be simply a doorway to an electricity station (we have no objection to this provided that it is adequately fenced off). There are however two other access points (one of which is immediately opposite our house) whose function is unclear. At present, there is only one exit for use only in the event of a fire (which is adequately fenced off). We have no objection to similar fire exits (ie. 2) in relation to the new development. We do however object if the purpose of the proposed access points go beyond that.
 - e. Loitering at proposed access points: At present, there is a regular problem, particularly in the summer, with large groups of (mainly) young men and drug-dealers loitering outside the car-park exit at the rear of Commonwealth Hall. The Council are invited to contact the Neighbourhood Police team to confirm this. To date, the Neighbourhood Police team have been unsuccessful in moving them away. As parents of three young girls, we are particularly concerned not to exacerbate this problem by the introduction of a range of new access points as presently proposed.
2. Light and space
 - a. As can be seen from the various photographs of Sandwich Street on the plans, it is a pleasant, light-filled and open street.
 - b. The proposed plan will radically alter the feel and space of the street in many respects.
 - c. Lightwells: It is not clear from the plans whether the existing lightwells will remain at their full width. During the public presentation of the plans, the University were unable to guarantee that there would be no extension of the present footprint of the three Halls into the lightwell zone. We think any encroachment will be seriously detrimental to the feel of the street: it will make the environment more claustrophobic.
-

Application No:	Site Address:	Case Officer:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:
2013/1598/P	University of London Garden Halls and Cartwright Gardens Open Space London WC1H 9FF - 9EF	Richard McEllistrum	Miss Anne Sutherland Local resident	15/05/2013 21:44:27	COMMNT

Response:

I wish to give my full support to the comments already made by Debbie Radcliffe, and by Margaret Scholey Hill.

Having attended an earlier public meeting about these proposals I neither heard, or saw from the artistic impressions made available, anything which commended the proposals to me. The present design is not one of real merit as far as I am concerned and it is disappointing, to say the least, that an opportunity to rebuild does not give a design which pleases those interested in architecture, the streetscape and those living close by, as well as improving its function.

Talking with a neighbour recently, he also expressed his dismay about the height and bulk of the proposed design.

Application No:	Site Address:	Case Officer:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:
2013/1598/P	University of London Garden Halls and Cartwright Gardens Open Space London WC1H 9FF - 9EF	Richard McEllistrum	Mr Desmond P.O Kilcoyne	15/05/2013 23:32:10	OBJ

Response:

Part 3

d. Impact of the height of the new building on Sandwich Street: It appears that the whole frontage onto Sandwich Street will be significantly higher than at present. This will inevitably reduce the light available to the lower floors of all the properties on the eastern side of Sandwich Street. We urge the Council not to accept the light reports produced by the developers. These are not independently verified and we assume that the Council would want to obtain its own expert advice on this particular matter. It goes without saying that if the footprint of the new building encroaches as described in (c) above, this also will have the effect of reducing the light on the eastern side at low levels.

3. Trees

a. The trees on Sandwich Street are well-established, thrive in the summer, and lend a soft, natural character to the street in keeping with the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.

b. It is imperative that these trees are preserved throughout the works and once the development is complete.

4. Noise

a. This development is likely to last for a significant period of time and impact greatly upon the presently quiet nature of the street, particularly during the day.

b. It is imperative that such noise as there will be is confined to working hours only, Monday to Friday.

5. Other responses

a. We have read the other representations posted online as part of the planning application and agree and adopt them, in particular the detailed points made in the letter from the Sandwich House residents (Jennifer Gould/ 28 April 2013).

We are submitting our objections online at the address we have been provided with by Jess Barratt but will also send this letter separately by email and by post. Please confirm safe receipt.

Application No:	Site Address:	Case Officer:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:
2013/1598/P	University of London Garden Halls and Cartwright Gardens Open Space London WC1H 9FF - 9EF	Richard McEllistrum	Mr matthew anthony	15/05/2013 22:34:50	OBJ

Response:

I do not have complete confidence in the Daylight Report's findings. It seems biased in favour of the development and there are items I have noticed which question the accuracy of the report.

Firstly, on page 10 paragraph 2, it talks about the proposed building and says:

"...the proposed massing for the car park rising to 15m in height"

This is factually incorrect as the height of the proposed structure in the car park is 38.198m according to Gia drawing 6173-48 (in Appendix 2).

What building height are the report's calculations actually based on; the height that is given by the drawings or the much lower height that is presented in the main report?

The same paragraph states that the separation distance between SST House and the proposed structure would be "just under 15m". According to TP Bennet drawing CO 501, the separation distance between SST House and the proposed structure would be 15.26m. Which of these separation distance values is the accurate figure? And why are the authors of this report and the architectural drawings not presenting a consistent picture?

Secondly, the report claims that it has made assumptions about room usage in SST Street. Living rooms and kitchens are given higher priority for daylight by the BRE guidelines, which are referenced repeatedly in this report. However, on the table in Appendix 3 of this report (Daylight Analysis – Vertical Sky Component), over 90% of the rooms in SST House have no room assumptions made for them. What room assumptions has it made for all the other rooms, if any? And would it affect the report's conclusions if they had assumed that most of these rooms facing the new development are living rooms, like mine is?

Thirdly, the report claims numerous windows in SST House will see a daylight benefit. But even though the proposed structure will be 1% shorter than the existing building(1/2m) it will also be 7% closer (1m) to SST House. According to Gia drawing 6173-48 the proposed building will be

Application No:	Site Address:	Case Officer:	Consultees Name:
2013/1598/P	University of London Garden Halls and Cartwright Gardens Open Space London WC1H 9FF - 9EF	Richard McEllistrum	Mr Neil Jarvis

Received:	Comment:
15/05/2013 16:51:54	OBJ

Response:

I wish to object to this new development.

My concern is over the height of the new building – I believe it is too tall and any new building should not be higher than the current highest existing building on the site.

I believe a 9-storey building here is inappropriate - particularly in relation to the existing buildings in Cartwright Gardens. It would dominate the crescent and overpower the Georgian buildings on the west side.

The new building would have an impact beyond Cartwright Gardens. My view from my flat in Judd Street would be severely diminished. Many of my neighbours are equally concerned. I also know of some neighbours in Sandwich Street, Leigh Street and Thanet Street who are concerned about the height as it will reduce light and views for them too.

The character of the neighbourhood is 5-storey mansion blocks and older 3-4 storey residential buildings. Other buildings within the immediate area generally fit in with these height levels.

This building is completely out of character with the neighbourhood.

I'm not objecting to a redevelopment of the site – nor for a building which manages to increase the amount of accommodation for students. The area is currently a happy mix of residents, businesses and students. It works well and it seems a pity to jeopardise the current harmony by imposing such a large monolith in the middle of our neighbourhood.

Application No:	Site Address:	Case Officer:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:
2013/1598/P	University of London Garden Halls and Cartwright Gardens Open Space London WC1H 9FF - 9EF	Richard McEllistrum	Desmond P.O Kilcoyne	15/05/2013 23:26:11	COMMNT

Response:

Part 1

We are long-term residents of Sandwich Street, having purchased our house in 1994, and we are extremely concerned about the impact of the proposed development of student accommodation at Garden Halls/Cartwright Gardens.

Sandwich Street has particular character as a quiet 'backwater', neighbourly street. It is very different to the busy city thoroughfares of Euston Road, Judd Street, Tavistock Place and the eastern side of Cartwright Gardens. We ask the Planning Office to ensure that Sandwich Street is protected from all forms of interference which detract from its present peaceful, residential character.

Our particular concerns with the proposed development are as follows:

1. Entrances/exits

- a. One of the particular features of Sandwich Street is that it only has access points to the properties on the eastern side of the street. This is a critical factor in the peaceful ambience of the street.
 - b. Number of access points: The proposed plan radically increases the number of access points onto Sandwich Street (from one fire exit to at least 13 potential entrances/exits). This will inevitably result in more pedestrian traffic/gathering, noise and litter within the immediate vicinity. We object to any new access points onto Sandwich Street.
 - c. Access points to the new terraced houses: As we understand it from the plans, these new access points will be open at all hours and therefore potentially give rise to late-night noise with the student population going to and fro into the early morning. At an earlier stage of the proposals the University itself suggested that they would ensure that these access points to the new terraced houses would be closed at 11pm. This suggestion directly recognised the concerns that we are expressing. It is not clear whether this is still envisaged. In any event, such a measure would present other difficulties, namely the use of the access points after 11pm by local youth and drug-dealers.
-

Application No:	Site Address:	Case Officer:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:
2013/1598/P	University of London Garden Halls and Cartwright Gardens Open Space London WC1H 9FF - 9EF	Richard McEllistrum	Ms Rosalyn Robinson	14/05/2013 20:10:47	COMMNT

Response:

COPY OF COMMENTS SUBMITTED 18th MARCH 2013

The main comments that we raised were

The position of this building is in a "village" type environment .

Appearance the size/bulk/ height of the building along its border with Leigh Street, and Sandwich Street is excessive.

Positioning ---the siting right up to the pavement along Leigh Street, and Sandwich Street is too close to the pavement.

Visual/style ---a building like this is more suited to the city where such buildings already exist and not to a "village" such as Marchmont .

Environmental/ community the size/height and closeness to the pavement of the building at the junction of Leigh Street and Sandwich Street, will plunge the opposite buildings the occupants and local community into perpetual darkness. Whilst this would be appropriate for a city where the heat/light of the sun is a problem, it is wholly inappropriate in Leigh/Sandwich Street (light and sunshine at a premium !! !).

Our suggestions are as follows

to reduce the height of the building along Leigh Street and Sandwich Street;

to set the building further back from the pavements along Leigh Street and Sandwich Street

"to minimally alter the design of the building " to create a corner within the building site, /within the perimeter railings /behind the pavements along the junction of Leigh Street and Sandwich Street, opposite the Norfolk Arms and to plant the area thus created with trees so as to reduce the detrimental impact that this building will have
