

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4679/P	Tommy Evans	Flat 42 37 Camden Road London NW1 9LR	09/09/2014 15:31:02	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I live at Flat 42, 37 Camden Road, London, NW1 9LR. I object to this planning application on the following grounds:</p> <p>Design and layout</p> <p>Character of Bonny Street:</p> <p>Bonny Street consists of quaint period Victorian houses and train station buildings, with more modern low rise commercial buildings to the western junction with Camden Street (site of proposed development). Despite the recent development at 37 Camden Road, this has had relatively little impact on the character of Bonny Street at street level as very little of the new buildings is visible from the Bonny Street itself, with the development only coming into view towards Camden Road station/Camden Road. However, the proposed development shows little regard to the existing character of Bonny Street and its buildings. The proposed design does little to mimic the styles and construction methods that are present on the street and will appear an eyesore looming over the end of the street. In my view there has not been enough thought given to the impact on Bonny Street at street level and the proposed development in its current form will damage the character of Bonny Street. The planning application documents submitted lack suitable analysis of this impact.</p> <p>Unit mix and affordable housing:</p> <p>Camden's planning policy targets 50% affordable housing on new housing sites in the borough. Policy states that this target can be applied on a sliding scale for developments of between 1,000 m2 and 5,000 m2 (10% for 1,000 m2, 20% for 2,000 m2, 30% for 4,000 m2 and 50% for sites delivering 5,000 m2 and above). The proposed development comprises of 4,110 m2 of new residential floorspace; however, only 25% of the proposed floorspace is affordable housing (either intermediate or social tenures).</p> <p>The 25% affordable housing proposed is substantially below the policy compliant level (40%), which suggests that there must be a financial viability issue with the site. However, I have my doubts about this given that the site's value in existing use is certain to be considerably less than the value of the site once redeveloped notwithstanding the significant costs involved building the scheme. Furthermore the developer has owned the site for many years and has not recently faced a significant outlay in order to purchase the site, unlike a typical commercial developer. No Financial Viability Assessment was provided in support of the planning application and so it is unclear whether the financial viability of the site has been properly assessed. In the absence of a suitable argument being made it is totally unacceptable that this scheme should deliver anything less than policy compliance.</p> <p>The affordable housing tenure split between social and intermediate units does not comply with policy. Policy states that developers should target 60% Social and 40% Intermediate, whereas the proposed scheme provides 45% Social and 55% Intermediate. Again it is unclear why there is this divergence from policy and whether this is due to financial viability matters as no Financial Viability Report has</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

been provided.

Scale and massing:

The proposed development reaches 9 storeys at its peak, which is too high and creates a number of issues. Other tall buildings in proximity to the proposed development include the Metropolitan Transport Police building which is 7 storeys and the recent development at 37 Camden Road, also 7 storeys. The 9 storeys proposed at the development sets a new precedent for the locality and is unacceptable both visually and in terms of its impact on the adjoining buildings (namely 37 Camden Road and buildings located on Bonny Street). The impact of this height will be felt most severely by the residents of 37 Camden Road that overlook the proposed development and on the canal side, both of which will suffer from a sense of enclosure. Given that the existing buildings located on the development site currently reach a maximum of two storeys, this feels like over development of site that is restricted by the canal, the busy Camden Street and the adjoining development of 37 Camden Road.

Poor permeability:

Camden Street is very busy with traffic and not pedestrian friendly, as such, Bonny Street will provide the natural pedestrian route for the new development. The proposed development will significantly increase the residential occupiers using Bonny Street a pedestrian thoroughway, which will significantly impact the residents of the street through increased noise, litter and anti-social behaviour.

Loss of daylight, sunlight and privacy of neighbours

The Daylight & Sunlight report prepared by Ansty Horne indicates that the proposed development will impact a number of the existing buildings, namely 1a & 1b Bonny Street, 148 Camden Street, 12-23 Camden Street. This suggests that the scale of development proposed is too large. The scale of development proposed is also going to impact upon the privacy of residents at 37 Camden Road, Bonny Street and Camden Street. In particular the east facing windows of the proposed private apartments will directly overlook residents of 37 Camden Road.

Traffic and parking issues

There are already parking issues on Bonny Street with access often restricted by turning vehicles caused by the nature of the cul-de-sac and existing parking restrictions. The intensification of residential occupiers is also likely to increase the number of vehicles attempting to use Bonny Street, which will exacerbate the parking issues that already exist.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4679/P	Mr Lawrence Foster	1 Bonny Street	19/09/2014 17:37:52	OBJ	<p>We object to the current development for the following reasons:</p> <p>Our building to the North side of Bonny Street at 1 Bonny Street has existing windows on the ground and 1st floors that will suffer from a noticeable reduction in Daylight and Sunlight due to the height, mass and scale of the proposed new development.</p> <p>We are aware that we enjoy a legally enforceable easement in respect to our windows and the development at 140-146 Camden Street due to a prescriptive right. (Prescription Act 1832)</p> <p>Material grounds for objection:</p> <p>1) Loss of Daylight & Sunlight to windows</p> <p>The applicant's document 'DAYLIGHT & SUNLIGHT REPORT by Anstey Horne', has not undertaken a BRE assessment on the impact of their development on our existing windows at 1 Bonny Street.</p> <p>We believe the application drawings indicate that the new development would noticeably impact upon our windows (using the BRE Report 25deg line). We request that the council request a BRE assessment to include our building.</p> <p>As noted in 4.7 of the application report: The BRE guidelines are intended for use for rooms in adjoining dwellings. They may also be applied to any existing non-domestic buildings where the occupants have a reasonable expectation of daylight, which could include schools, hospitals, hotels and offices.</p> <p>2) Loss of Daylight & Sunlight by overshadowing to roof terrace (amenity space).</p> <p>The applicant's document 'DAYLIGHT & SUNLIGHT REPORT by Anstey Horne', has not undertaken an assessment on the impact of their development on our existing roof terrace at 1 Bonny Street</p> <p>Due to the scale, height and mass of proposed development there will be increased overshadowing to the extent that our roof top amenity space is left with a significantly less pleasant environment to be.</p> <p>Due to the scale height and mass of proposed development there will be increased overshadowing to the extent that our Planting to the main Building exterior could be significantly affected.</p> <p>We request that the council request a BRE assessment to include our building.</p>