

Dike, Darlene

From: Vivienne Colchester [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 April 2014 15:35
To: Planning
Subject: Ref 2014/2115/P - attention Jenna Litherand

Dear Jenna,

I am sending this email as, although I tried to use the website to send them, I am not entirely convinced I was successful. My apologies, if it did work and this is a duplication.

Planning Application - 2014/2115/P, Change of use from office (Class B1a) to residential (Class C3) to provide 54 residential units.

We are residents on the top floor of the building in question.

We object to the application because:-

(1) Increased traffic. 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. The report makes the point about there only being 5 parking spaces but we do not believe 54 households will be car-free.

The nature of the proposed work is quite major. Two stair cores are being demolished and new cores formed in the atrium. 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.

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.

(2) Loss of employment in the borough. 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.

(3) Adverse pressure on local services. 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 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. It is understood that, if approved, this scheme will require no further consultation. If that is the case there may well be 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) Incorrect interpretation of the GPDO 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 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

For these reasons we object to this application.

Vivienne and Stephen Colchester
Flat 7 Parkview House, NW1 7DN