



Sadiq Merchant  
Design Engineer  
Transport Strategy Service  
London Borough of Camden  
Argyle Street  
London. WC1H 8EQ

**Scheme Reference No.:** - CO-25  
**Planning Reference:** 2012/6189/P

Dear Mr. Merchant,

Thank you for your letter dated 6<sup>th</sup> June 2013 regarding the public consultation on parking request for proposed parking changes to accommodate 2.4 metre wide vehicular crossover at 166 Goldhurst Terrace.

There are two proposals in this letter:

- 1- The creation of a permit's holder's parking bay outside the common boundary of 128-130 Goldhurst Terrace, proposal which we warmly welcome, as we would any attempt to create more parking spaces
- 2- To make traffic orders under sections of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to alter the existing 44.6 metres of permit holder parking bay by removing 4.6 metres of parking bay, proposal which **we strongly object to** as creating a net loss of parking spaces

1-

We have no doubt that it is a constant care of the Highways Officer and of Camden council to try and alleviate the acute parking problems faced by Camden residents such as those in Goldhurst Terrace. We assume that the Highways Officer is actively seeking ways to create any parking space in ways similar to the above proposal without waiting for residents' suggestions. If this were not the case, we, together with the local residents' associations, would be happy to suggest to Mr. John Duffy more ways to create additional parking spaces in Goldhurst Terrace. While we welcome the creation of a parking space outside 128-130 GT, it is way too far from 166 GT to be considered a valid replacement of one of the three parking spaces that would be lost as a result of the crossover proposal.

2-

The loss of on-street parking spaces, as proposed, would heighten on-street parking demand in an area where on-street parking spaces cannot meet existing demand, and require detrimental amendment to an existing Controlled Parking Zone (CA-R). As a consequence the proposal would have

a harmful impact on local on-street parking conditions contrary to Policies DP19 and DP21

As opposed to the recently granted permission of a crossover at 211 Goldhurst Terrace, where a public parking space was being replaced by a private one (one for one), the proposed development at 166 Goldhurst Terrace would harm on-street parking conditions. In the case of 211 GT, the existing parking bay prior to the crossover could not park more than two cars. It was replaced by a parking bay for one car and by a private off-street parking space, so there was no net loss of parking spaces. In the case of 166 GT, the proposal would cut the existing 44.6 metres of permit holder parking bay in two by removing 4.6 metres of parking bay inside. The result is already observable as these 4.6 metres are currently occupied by a skip used for the excavations works authorized at 166 GT. The resulting bay East of the skip can only park two cars and to the West of the skip, only four cars can park most of the time, a total of six parking spaces. As pointed out in my earlier objection to planning permission 2012/6189/P, the length of the 44.6 m parking bay allows for greater flexibility than two smaller bays, and, as a result, this long bay usually holds nine cars. Therefore, after the creation of one private parking space, there will still be a net loss of two parking spaces.

#### FLAWED CONSULTATION PROCESS

There are errors in the 3 Officer Delegated Reports related to planning application 2012/6189/P posted on the Camden website:

Those reports state that the No. of objections to the planning application 2012/6189/P is 1: this is incorrect as I am aware of at least 5 objections from neighbours, who by the way never received any consultation letters from the council. For example my objection (170 GT flat 1), which the council acknowledged in a letter dated 15 January 2013, is not recorded in any Officer Delegated Report.

Out of the ten original consultation letters sent by the council, six were addressed to residents in Aberdare Gardens, i.e. a different street than the one where the proposed parking changes applied, but none to the residents in Goldhurst Terrace not immediately adjacent to 166 GT.

Yours sincerely,

Anne Alexandre

Cc: - Camden Planning Dept.  
- Combined Residents Association of South Hampstead (CRASH)

Mr Sadiq Merchant  
Design Engineer Highways Mgt.Team  
London Borough of Camden  
Camden Town Hall  
Argyle St.  
London WC1H 8EQ



Re: Planning Application: 2012/6189/P  
Scheme Reference No.: CO-25

Dear Mr Merchant,

**Re: 1) Objection to Proposed Parking Changes to accommodate 2.4m wide crossover and 4.6m of dropped kerb and single yellow line outside 166 Goldhurst Terrace.  
2) Concerns over inadequate consultation opportunity for the original 2012/6189/P application for off-street parking and Objection to the application.**

Thank you for your letter of 6<sup>th</sup> June describing and inviting comments and objections on this proposal.

I hereby inform you of my objection to the proposal on the grounds that this will make parking even more difficult for the other residents that currently share the only existing "long bay" in the area between Nos.164 and 172 that can accommodate a reasonable number of cars. On the opposite side of the road, there is provision for only two single parking bays between 229 and 235. Parking is already very difficult along the whole length of Goldhurst Terrace.

Replacement of the lost 4.6m of CPZ bay (incidentally far more than the length of an average car) with a new bay some 200m away will not benefit those of us in the vicinity of No. 166 and – particularly for families with children - would make the carrying of children and their paraphernalia to and from house and car even more difficult and time-consuming.

Also currently this long bay can accommodate 9 – 10 cars. Cutting it in two parts would reduce the flexibility that a large bay allows and the resulting two pieces would probably not fit more than 1 + 4 cars. This is completely unacceptable to the whole near neighbourhood.

If this scheme were to be allowed against the best interests of all those near No. 166, then the only acceptable alternative space that should be created, as a condition of it being approved, would be re-designate the space between Nos. 235 and 237 Goldhurst Terrace (opposite the long bay in question) as a CPZ space (currently it is single yellow-lined). This space can accommodate cars of average length and is acceptably near to the space that is under threat of being removed.

## **2) Concern re. Inadequate Consultation on original Planning Application 2012/6189/P**

I also have a major concern about the way in which the original Planning Application 2012/6189/P (for creation of a hard-standing, and demolition of the front wall), was inadequately publicised in late-Nov./early December 2012 to all the nearby dwelling owners.

Effectively we were not Consulted and therefore given no opportunity to object, as we did not know about it! There were no individual letters sent, as was fortunately the case with the current application for a cross-over. The Consultation process followed was inadequate and deficient and appears to have been undertaken by stealth.

I understand that a tiny notice was apparently posted on a lamp post near 166 Goldhurst Terrace but not seen by myself and many of my neighbours. Given that this has been a Conservation Area for many years, I would think that maintaining the original look of the street, which was one of houses with front gardens not parking spaces, would automatically mitigate against approval for more off street parking.

**If I had been correctly and rightfully consulted in December 2012 on that application for the creation of a hard-standing then I would have Objected and pointed out that it contravened Development Policies DP19 and DP21 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework (see Annex 1), as well as Para. 13.45 of the South Hampstead Conservation Area statement (see Annex 2).**

In addition, by creating so much additional hard-landscaping compared with what was previously there, and also noting that at the same address there is now excavation in progress to create a new basement, there will be adverse impacts on natural surface water drainage and the local water table level. It is worth reminding you that prior to its original development in the late 1890s, the South Hampstead "gardens" area was a marshy water meadow, so it already suffers from drainage issues.

Because of my real concerns that due process, in terms of there being adequate Consultation, was not followed with the original November 2012 Planning application for the creation of the hard-standing/off-street parking, I am also copying this to the Camden Planning Dept. and also to the local residents association CRASH.

**Can the Approval of the original application be reviewed or called-in please to enable a proper period of publicity and Consultation, such that local residents comments can be adequately solicited and taken on board?**

I look forward to hearing from you and trust that these points will be fully taken into consideration when making the decision.

Yours sincerely,

Eric Peel

Cc: - Camden Planning Dept.  
- Combined Residents Association of South Hampstead (CRASH)

#### **Annex 1: Relevant extracts from Camden Development Policies:**

DP19 – Managing the impact of parking. This policy aims to ensure that the creation of additional car parking spaces does not have negative impact on parking, highways or the general environment. Development that would cause harm to on-street parking or require detrimental amendments to Controlled Parking Zones is unlikely to be acceptable.

DP21 – Development connecting to the highway network. In relation to this application part e) is relevant where the Council expects development to avoid harm to on-street parking or require detrimental amendments to Controlled Parking Zones.

**Annex 2: Relevant extracts from South Hampstead Conservation Area – Character Appraisal and Management Strategy – Feb. 2011 (SHCA)**

Paragraph 13.45 refers to "... the loss of front garden spaces can significantly detract from the appearance of the area and further harm is caused by the paving over of green spaces, loss of boundary walls and hedges, the erection of inappropriate walls, railings and gates and the visual intrusion of the cars themselves parked within the former garden. Unfortunately a significant number of gardens and boundary walls have been removed in the area, making the retention of those surviving, and the reinstatement of those lost, a high priority."

Sadiq Merchant  
Design Engineer  
Transport Strategy  
London Borough of Camden  
Argyle Street  
London. WC1H 8EQ



**Scheme Reference No.:** - CO-25  
**Planning Reference:** 2012/6189/P

Dear Mr. Merchant,

Thank you for your letter dated 6<sup>th</sup> June 2013 regarding the public consultation for the proposed parking changes as requested by resident at 166 Goldhurst Terrace.

I would like to take this opportunity to make an objection for the above request based on the following reasons:

We suffer from a chronic shortage of parking bays in the section of the Goldhurst Terrace where the request has been raised. The existing bay from 164 to 172 is the only 'long' bay section in the area that can accommodate a reasonable number of cars. On the opposite side of the road, there is provision for only two separate parking bays between 229 and 235.

The proposed replacement bay is of a significant distance (roughly 20 houses / 150m) from where the proposed reduction has been requested, this is proof in itself that no satisfactory solution nor alternative is available to alleviate the dire parking issues we face. Combined with the fact that there are several families (including ourselves) within the immediate vicinity with young babies and children that depend on the parking bay, the proposal is not acceptable when trying to ferry children with paraphernalia such as prams / car seats, etc. to and from the car.

Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to understand how the planning regulations have change since earlier applications were made with Camden regarding off-street parking. More importantly, how the above request is different from the following: my neighbour; Eric Peel made an application for a crossover in 1995 and 1996 [9560191 and PW9605051 respectively], the applications were refused on the basis that the demolition of the front wall would be "detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area". Prior to our residence at 172, we requested planning permission to extend our property and at the same time for a crossover [2009/2305/P]; the feedback received from the planning department was a point blank refusal (earlier reason cited.).

I look forward to hearing from you and trust that these points will be taken into consideration when making the decision.

Kind regards,

Rajesh Mistry