

General enquiry form - Ref. 8502916

Customer

Name

stephen W taylor

My enquiry is

follow up comments re planning application number:- 2013/0592/P. Please acknowledge receipt

object to the application for reasons below:-

My primary concerns relative to this planning application are the increase in both pedestrian and vehicular traffic in the area combined with the diminution of the availability of parking, there will be little to no parking in the area unless more residents are allowed residents permits (which I believe are not permitted relative to 4/6 Britannia St and the student residents development. Currently the site in question is used for car parking and is usually full. Where are residents and contractors supposed to park? I would hope that if this development is allowed more residents parking will be granted, this could be assisted by the removal of the 2 doctors spaces which are rarely used, the diplomatic spaces and the shared car ownership spaces. Could there be some review of car parking in the area combined with the consideration of this development.

2. Moving on to my 2nd and equally if not more important concern is the loss of daylight sunlight. Having examined the day light and sun light study prepared my fellow chartered surveyors employed by rights of light consulting I am sorry to say that I find it inaccurate and misleading. I would respectfully request that this is returned to rights of light consulting in order for them to reconsider their findings inlight of some of the comments made below:-

eg: in certain instances the labelling of windows is misleading in so far as it paints a picture

inappropriately that there is not an intense habitable usage behind the windows photographed. To give but a few examples it seems to me inappropriate in the first photograph to label the window next to window 1 inhabitable as this is a link between living, kitchen and bedroom accommodation. The description non habitable is inappropriate as it is actually habited. These inaccuracies continue when describing 6 and 7 as bedrooms. Window 7 is infact to a study and additional living accommodation. Windows 12, 15 and 17 are all to the primary habitable living accommodation of self contained flats, 18 19 and 20 are described as bedroom/ lounge however the apartment on the 3rd floor to which most of these windows belong has approximately 50% of its frontage and by far the largest window associated with purely living accommodation. It is of course not my job to go through the whole survey window by window and correct inaccuracies, it is for them to present a survey which is accurate, and gives a truer impression of the intense habitable use connected to all the windows which will be affected should the construction of a 7 storey building occur. Whilst there fore we do not object to the proposed use which is low cost hotel accommodation but feel that construction to 7 storeys is excessive and affects natural light to an unacceptable extent. We would feel it much more equitable if the developers were only allowed to develop to similar height to adjacent buildings. It would appear that the majority of buildings within Britannia St are a maximum of 5 storeys.

I submit that it would still be a viable project for the developers as 120 bedrooms is more than enough for low cost hotel rooms to be viable. This would be a mutually acceptable alternative design. I hope you find our comments constructive and helpful.
Stephen Taylor

I would like to be contacted by

Email

Phone

Address

BA, Dip Surv Oxford, FRICS

eMail

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Contact Development Management

About this form

Issued by

Council and Democracy

Camden Town Hall

Judd Street

London WC1H 9JE

Received on

27/05/2013

Form reference

8502916

Contact method

Self service