

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/2115/P	Tamy Craddock	11/36 Arlington Road Camden NW1 7HU	14/04/2014 14:17:12	OBJ	<p>We object to the application because:-</p> <p>(1) Increased transport.</p> <p>54 new dwellings will bring increased traffic to the immediate area. Although the Freeholder may offer to enter agreement to exclude these dwellings from Residents' Permits, residents' own vehicles form only one small aspect of traffic; 54 new units will require frequent delivery vans and trucks, will increase taxi numbers, and will increase the number of visitors' cars.</p> <p>Furthermore I do not believe 54 households will be car-free. There always are car owners and they find ways to park their cars, either by renting lock-ups, nearby driveways, or garage spaces, or through fraudulent use of Residents' Permits from other addresses - this will also increase traffic in the borough.</p> <p>The nature of the proposed work is quite major. Two stair cores are being demolished and new cores formed in the atrium. This will necessitate heavy construction traffic. We have already endured nearly two years' of significant local disruption from the water mains replacement and are likely to further suffer from the HS2 works traffic. The proposed development would be likely to contribute unacceptably to traffic disruption and be detrimental to general highway and pedestrian safety and residential amenity, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework chapter 4, paragraph 29 and 32.</p> <p>The proposed development, in the absence of a Section 106 legal agreement securing a contribution towards the provision of public open space, would be likely to contribute to pressure and demand on existing open space in this area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework chapter 7, paragraph 58 and chapter 8, paragraph 73.</p> <p>The proposed development, in the absence of a Section 106 legal agreement to secure affordable housing would fail to maximise the contribution of the site to the supply of affordable housing in the borough and fail to contribute towards the delivery of mixed and balanced communities, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework chapter 6, paragraph 50.</p> <p>(2) Loss of employment in the borough.</p> <p>Carlow House is currently office accommodation. This provides employment opportunity in the borough for several hundred people. The loss of this employment will be detrimental to the locality.</p> <p>(3) Adverse pressure on local services.</p> <p>54 new dwellings will put unreasonable extra pressure on the already stretched local schools, hospitals and social services. The proposed development, in the absence of a Section 106 legal agreement</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

securing a contribution towards educational infrastructure, would place an unacceptable strain on existing local educational resources, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework chapter 8, paragraph 72.

(4) Loss of amenity.

Carlow House is currently designed as mixed use: thirteen residential units above four floors of offices. It is a very effective formula. The addition of 54 new dwellings will cause extra noise and disruption resulting in loss of amenity for thirteen households.

(5) Reduced fire safety.

If I understand GPDO correctly, if approved, this scheme will require no further consultation. If that is the case then I am extremely concerned about the increased fire risk. The residential units currently have use of four emergency exit stair cores; one in each corner of the building. The new proposal intends removing two of these cores and giving over their floor space to the new apartments. There is a proposal to add two new cores in the central atrium but they don't rise up to our floor, plus they are NOT protected means of escape and don't terminate at final exit.

Therefore the building would be losing 50% of its emergency escape routes. This is an unacceptable risk.

(6) Inaccuracies in the Application.

The Application states the claim that "no external alterations to the building are proposed" but the 1980's "Crittall" type windows will not comply with Approved Documents Part L and will require replacement. Therefore the Application is in error.

Furthermore the Application shows new residential accommodation where our current emergency stair cores numbers 2 and 4 are, this means the current window positions won't work with the new floor slabs. Either the windows will all have to be moved or blocked up. Either way the phrase "no external alterations" is factually wrong.

(7) Incorrect interpretation of the law.

The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (England) Order 2013 under its Class J, allows:

"Permitted development. Development consisting of a change of use of a building and any land within

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

its curtilage to a use falling within Class C3 (dwelling houses) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order from a use falling within Class B1 (a) (offices) of that Schedule."

The existing building is NOT exclusively Class B1a. It is currently mixed use with us living on the top floor. There is no provision in the law for change of use from mixed use to Class C3.

The Applicant is wrong to make this application under GPDO.
