


Judi Bevan and John Jay



Niall Sheehan
Regeneration and Planning
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London
WC1H 8ND

21st May 2014

Dear Mr Sheehan,

Application Ref: 2014/2762/P 4-5 Coleridge Gardens, NW6 3QH

Please accept this letter as a formal objection to the proposed redevelopment of the office block at 4-5 Coleridge Gardens, NW6 3QH.

My family has lived in Belsize Road for 13 years and we have always enjoyed the peace and quiet of our back garden in a district that is principally residential in character and is within a Conservation Area. My wife and I accept that the buildings in Coleridge Gardens have been partly or wholly commercial for many decades but the low density of the office premises is a mitigating factor within an overwhelmingly residential area. The redevelopment at 4-5 Coleridge Gardens and the significant increase in height and density will have a number of negative effects on the neighbours. It will significantly reduce the light in our gardens, it will significantly increase the noise, it will reduce the pleasant views of neighbourhood trees and it will significantly reduce our privacy. This makes the application objectionable.

We find the attempt to redevelop the offices doubly objectionable because the owners and their tenants have a record of being bad neighbours. We have been told that they installed south-facing windows on the second floor of the property a few years ago without obtaining planning permission, something that we would have thought was profoundly distasteful to your planning officers. Retrospective approval was granted, we understand, but only on the condition that the windows would be frosted like the pre-existing ground floor windows and would be kept closed to preserve the privacy of the residents of Belsize Road to the south. Yet, there have been many occasions when the windows have been opened so that office workers can stare into the gardens and into the houses to the south. Office workers smoke from the open windows and throw their butts into the gardens of their neighbours below. They also stand and smoke on the platform at the west end of the building, talking loudly into their mobile phones and disturbing the peace of neighbours relaxing in their gardens. As you might imagine, this is profoundly distressing for the neighbours. Any redevelopment that would increase the size of the offices and increase the number of windows from which office workers can intrude on the privacy of neighbours would only compound the problems.

Yours sincerely,



John Jay



[REDACTED]

Sent: 22 May 2014 11:39
To: Planning
Subject: Application ref 2014/2762/P 4-5 Coleridge Gardens NW6 3QH- [REDACTED]
Attachments: John Jay 2014-2762-P 4-5 Coleridge Gardens planning objection letter 21.05.14.pdf

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please accept this letter objecting to the redevelopment plans at 4-5 Coleridge Gardens NW6 3QH, application ref 2014/2762/P.

A hard copy of this letter will follow in the post.

Yours faithfully,

John Jay

[REDACTED]

This e-mail may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient (or have received this e-mail in error) please notify the sender immediately and delete this e-mail, together with any copies, from your system. Any unauthorised copying, disclosure or distribution of the material in this e-mail is strictly forbidden. This Message is attributed to the sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Brompton Asset Management Group LLP, its subsidiaries or associates.

This transmission has been issued by a member of the Brompton Group of Companies, the parent company of which is Brompton Asset Management Group LLP, registered office 1 Knightsbridge Green, London SW1X 7QA. Registered in England. Brompton Asset Management LLP is authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority. We may record telephone calls or email for our mutual protection and to improve customer service

[REDACTED]

Sent: 23 May 2014 21:32
To: Planning
Subject: Application ref 2014/2762/P, 4-5 Coleridge Gardens NW6 3QH- [REDACTED]
Categories: Orange Category

Dear Camden Council,

I hereby lodge a formal objection to the above planning application for the following reasons:

1. The redevelopment of offices is significant as it calls for an increase of 50% in number of employees in the offices to be redeveloped, from 30 to 45. This will dramatically increase the noise level and will affect my privacy and the residential nature of the neighbourhood.

Residential properties in our area are not allowed to expand, so why allow an office space to expand? It will upset the balance in the neighbourhood, especially in the dense area like ours.

Per the application, the working hours are limited to 9.00 - 5.30 and "little weekend work" which cannot be enforced or controlled. Enforcement of the agreed use of the windows facing my property has failed in recent years.

2. Loss of light:

While the report attached to the application suggests minimal or no loss of light to my property, and a significant loss of light to the properties on Goldhurst Terrace, I would need more time to obtain an advice on this factor.

4-5 Coleridge Gardens NW6 is actually nearer the Belsize Road properties than Goldhurst Terrace ones since the gardens on the Belsize Road side are shorter.

3. Visual amenity and design:

The erection of an additional storey and the raising of the roof is substantial from the view point of my property, as the additional storey will directly face my 1st floor living room and 2nd floor bedroom, bringing an unattractive structure directly in front of me and very close, compared with the current view of Goldhurst Terrace properties which are far removed.

Currently the green trees on the gardens of Goldhurst Terrace occupy the major part of the view from my flat, and it is a big concern that the new structure will block a substantial part of that greenery.

In particular I oppose the structure of "the dormer meeting room" which is south facing and directly facing my 1st floor living room and 2nd floor bedroom:

- it is not nice looking, not integral to the roof and to the additional storey, and it's design looks awkward to say the least.
- it is not in keeping with the proposed curved roof structure or current pitched roof.

- it is closer to my property than the additional storey facing the north elevation, so its impact on my flat would be greater.
- and crucially, it is designed to be a meeting room so the noise level are of a particular concern.
- the materials, seam metal roof and timber clad wall, while environmentally sustainable, are again not in keeping with the current simple structure of the roof.

4. If this plan is realised, the construction process in such a small space with narrow access is likely to cause a great disruption and aggravation. The crane that is proposed to be positioned on the South part of the roof facing Belsize Road 72-76 is very near my property and will cause major disruption to me.

I therefore strongly oppose this application and suggest that it is refused in line with the recent applications for 4-5 Coleridge Gardens NW6. I am uncertain why this application is being put forward to consultation given the previous objections and declines.

Plans if approved will have adverse impact on the quality of life of Camden residents like myself. We already have a very busy road in front of us with buses and heavy traffic. We are entitled to have peace and quiet in our back yard.

Sincerely,

Sarig Peker



Regeneration and Planning
Development Management
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London WC1H 8ND

27th May 2014

Dear Sirs

Planning Reference: 2014\2762\P – 4/5 Coleridge Gardens, London NW6 3QH

SweetTree Home Care Services is the long term tenant of the units comprising 1,2,3,6,7 Coleridge Gardens, NW6 3QH which acts as the entrance to and adjacent buildings for the above property. We are very grateful to you for circulating the information on this proposed development as, despite speaking to the owners of the building regularly, they have never once mentioned their development intentions or discussed the logistics of their intended project with us.

By way of background, SweetTree Home Care Services provides care and support to over 450 frail elderly and disabled individuals living in their own homes. We operate a specialist service model of support which includes the provision of assistance for those with Brain Injuries, Learning Disabilities, Dementia, Neurological Conditions and Palliative (end of life) care. While the support we provide to clients and their families is generally delivered within their own homes, clients and family members regularly visit SweetTree's offices for meetings and special events taking place on site. Indeed, we have just recently opened an activities Lounge in Unit 6 – Coleridge Gardens, where we hold special education and training sessions for clients and their families.

From the beginning I believe it is worth making clear that we would strenuously object to the proposed building works for the following reasons.

1. The entrance to Coleridge Gardens, control of which is included in the lease which we have on the site, is narrow and unsuitable for the deliveries which would be required to facilitate a development of this nature taking place.
2. Due to the horseshoe shape of the site (see enclosed site plan) the required works to 4/5 Coleridge Gardens would cause huge disruption to our working environment and the access we have to the units we occupy on the site.
3. Given the limited space available on site we would have to restrict the access to it in relation to this development leaving the developer to park, unload and store goods and demolition waste on Fairhazel Gardens. Should consideration be given to granting permission for these works, we would suggest that a strategy also be derived for managing the logistics as well as there is no room within Coleridge Gardens for these.



SWEETTREE
HOME CARE SERVICES

COLERIDGE HOUSE
1 COLERIDGE GARDENS
LONDON
NW6 3QH

4. When the owners of 4/5 Coleridge Gardens have carried out works previously there have been long periods of time when they have attempted to use the Coleridge Gardens site for the above and during these periods vast congestion was caused on Fairhazel Gardens.
5. The ground floor offices located at 2/3 Coleridge Gardens and 6/7 Coleridge Gardens are already dark and due to the scale, nature and layout of the proposed development this problem will be greatly exacerbated by this development. These units will probably be unusable if this development takes place. Should the need arise to sublet this space the proposed development would have a substantial impact on the rental value which we are too small a company to absorb.
6. The construction process which would be required to erect the extensions concerned would clearly create a party wall issue and will no doubt require a reconfiguration of our roof which we would not accept. Any works to this property would also disrupt our day to day workings and have a considerable impact on our ability to serve our clients.
7. It should be noted that 4/5 Coleridge Gardens and 1& 2 Coleridge Gardens were developed at roughly the same time and the roof of 2/3 Coleridge Gardens is made up of asbestos sheeting. Should this be disturbed without the proper precautions being made, it would have very significant health and safety implications for our employees and the operation of our business.
8. The noise, disruption to access, and hazards created during the development of the above would make it impossible for our clients, their families and others visiting our site to be impossible. Our new lounge located in Unit 6 Coleridge Gardens would become unusable and the operational and financial implications of this unbearable for a company of our nature and size. We have also discussed the development proposals for 4/5 Coleridge Gardens with those occupying other offices on this site and they have said that they would move off site if planning permission is granted.
9. The impact that this development would have across our site would be catastrophic and create a great deal of unusable space on our site. There is no way a small company like ours could carry the financial burden associated with this. We have a long term lease on this site which we could not afford to service and this could result in the closure of our business.
10. From the imagery we have seen, it would appear that there is a proposal to use the existing drains on site to take rainwater from the roof and extension to the site. As the drains are currently designed there is no way the existing drainage would accommodate more water than is currently being managed as these already overflow and resolving this would require a complete redevelopment of the drive and drainage leading into Fairhazel Gardens.

As you may appreciate, being the long term lease holders of the adjacent property we believe that a development of the proposed nature will have considerable impact on our business and the commitment we made in the property we made when signing the lease. We are stringently opposed to the proposed development and would happily support this opposition in person if that would be helpful.

Your time and consideration with regards to the above are much appreciated.

Yours faithfully



Barry Sweetbaum
Founder

[REDACTED]

Sent: 22 May 2014 11:25
To: Planning
Subject: RE: Camden planning application which will affect 72 Belsize Road 2014/2762/P-[REDACTED]

Dear Sir / Madam

Concerning the planning application in Coleridge Gardens, we wish to register a formal objection to the proposed development.

Firstly this is a conservation area in which the historic aesthetics of the area should be conserved as a primarily residential area. We have no right to change our roof lines, or construct a new floor, or develop our house in any way we see fit, and we believe that should apply to the current development in question too. The proof of it being residential is that our rear view stretches over the current building to the trees and houses of Goldhurst Terrace behind. It is not an aesthetically pleasing design and it will block our view completely as a result of the intended extra floor and roof line. It will change the character of the neighborhood from primarily residential to commercial. Secondly the current occupants do not keep to the agreement set down in their planning application. They developed windows on the second floor without permission some years back, winning retrospective approval to build only after agreeing formally not to overlook the residential properties they now intrude into. We certainly do not trust them to look directly into our bedroom and bathroom, on the 2nd floor of our house, if they construct a further floor. We regard this as a gross intrusion of our privacy.

Thirdly we note from the application lodged that the light levels for some of the houses in Belsize Road are negatively affected by up to 17.7%. This is unacceptable. We are also not clear on what basis measurements could be taken for our house. No visit was made by anyone to 72 Belsize Road or to our knowledge any other house in our road so we challenge the accuracy of the measurement. We are willing to employ our own planning consultant to provide a second opinion.

Yours sincerely

Sanjay Agarwal

[REDACTED]