

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4309/P	Tamy Craddock	Flat 11/36 Arlington Road Camden NW1 7HU	05/08/2014 14:15:40	OBJ	I am oppose to the change to this development to increase the number of flats on the grounds of increased traffic in the area - which is already highly congested.
2014/4309/P	Huw Jeremy	Flat 7 36 Arlington Road NW1 7HU	02/08/2014 17:58:46	COMMNT	<p>As a resident of the building immediately adjacent to Carlow House, I object to this amendment.</p> <p>The original planning application (which was for 54 residential units) was, as I understand it, only granted on the basis of professional projections of noise and traffic impacts.</p> <p>The addition of a further 31 units to this plan would clearly increase the noise and traffic created by the new development, and would create a significant nuisance and diminishment of quality of life for those who live and work in the vicinity of this development.</p> <p>This would apply not only during the course of redevelopment but also for the long-term on an ongoing basis.</p>
2014/4309/P	rob macdonald	5 Parkview House Miller Street London NW1 7DN	04/08/2014 12:45:49	OBJ	<p>The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (England) Order 2013 under its Class J, allows:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Carlow House and Parkview House are one building for all intents and purposes. Parkview House is the top floor of Carlow House. They are both inter-dependent on each other. They have a common roof and supports; interconnecting doorways; shared common areas (plant room, lift rom etc) and a joint insurance policy. One could not exist without the other. To the man on the Clapham Omnibus they are one building. This makes the entity a mixed use building. Indeed we cannot buy the Freehold of the building as this is not allowed as 75% of the "building" is offices. This is not the kind of building meant to be covered by the above order. 85new 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. We reject the claims made in the submitted Traffic Report because:-The report takes a highly selective sample between 08:00 and 18:00. Traffic introduced beyond those times would definitely be greater than the status quo and would thus have more impact on the neighbouring residences.</p>
2014/4309/P	rob macdonald	5 Parkview House Miller Street London NW1 7DN	04/08/2014 12:46:01	OBJ	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4309/P	Paul Syrysko	11 Parkview House	04/08/2014 18:51:18	OBJ	<p>The application constitutes an increase of over 50% in the number of residential units proposed in the preceding application. This will result in an unsustainable increase in traffic.</p> <p>The traffic of delivery and visitor vehicles will overwhelm the street, even if residents all use public transport and cycles for personal needs.</p> <p>No parking is provided, in garages on on street. HS2 will remove much of what street parking there is for long periods.</p> <p>Turning the atrium into an airshaft, with 60 windows, and 40 doors opening on to it, will create a flue, or chimney, represents a fire risk. Exits are inadequate in an emergency for 300 people. No large fire engine access is feasible, Carlow and Miller Streets are narrow and preclude large tender access.</p>
2014/4309/P	John Sutherland	8 Parkview House 11-13 Miller Street London NW17DN	02/08/2014 14:38:33	PETITNOBJ E	<p>I wish to lodge objections to Camden to the amended proposal (85 units) on the following pertinent grounds.</p> <p>(1) density. The Galliard project will be jammed between high occupancy Carlow Street housing block and the three multi-story 'Fields' (Briarfield, etc) blocks. No parking is provided, in garage on on street, for the Galliard 85 apartment project. HS2 will remove much of what street parking there is for long periods. The approved lower density plan (i.e. 54 units) is therefore optimal.</p> <p>(2) For the voting Camden residents on the fourth floor, several with families, the new development will infringe legal 'quiet enjoyment' rights. The approved 54-unit plan is therefore optimal.</p> <p>(3) turning the existing atrium into an airshaft, with 100+ windows, and 50+ doors opening on to narrow companion ways, will create a flue, or chimney, which represents a manifest fire risk which has not been investigated. Exitage may well be inadequate, in an emergency at night, for 300 people. No large fire engine access is feasible, given the narrowness of Carlow and Miller Streets and no frontal access to either Parkview or the UCU office building. The approved 54-unit plan is therefore optimal.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4309/P	Russell Lock	65 Arlington Road London NW1 7ES	06/08/2014 13:03:28	OBJ	<p>As a resident of Camden for 30 years I am raising a STRONG OBJECTION to this proposal. Camden Council may be keen to obtain benefits from taxes for this huge new number of residents but current services are already insufficient</p> <p>Having spent some years sitting on the Camden Area Advisory Council I am aware that individual objections do not attract much attention but nevertheless we must try to obtain some degree of democratic process pursued here</p> <p>1. Current residents of Carlow House park vehicles within the building. With the proposal this will no longer be possible so where does the Council propose to provide parking for current residents of Carlow House AND possibly 85 other vehicles. There is already overload on parking places and it is frequently necessary to park some way from our homes. The Council has a responsibility for providing such spaces. We might all like to be more green but even then where can we park our electric vehicles?</p> <p>Another major residential development is taking place in the same area with the demolition of the Fox & Goose pub AND adjacent Billiard Hall [despite much objection].</p> <p>These same arguments for the over-extension of stretched and inadequate facilities need also be applied to:</p> <p>2. Healthcare. What consultation and arrangements have been discussed with Local Practitioners and Hospitals? It is already extremely difficult to get G.P. appointments within a two week period</p> <p>3. Education, likewise for nursery groups and local schools</p> <p>4. Sanitation, street cleaning is not of the highest standard. Dumping of rubbish in the street is not followed up by the Council without persistent complaints; this can only get worse. Although re-cycling is pursued by the Council, the local environment is still not of the highest standard. Dog owners please note both from mess and mouse points of view</p> <p>5. The increased pressure on local open spaces and parks.</p> <p>6. What a time to consider doing this huge development when HS2 is looming heavily over the current quiet enjoyment of our homes and local environment. The roads will be overloaded with construction traffic and the surfaces will deteriorate. Pollution, which the Council has always been keen to avoid, will increase hugely from all these vehicles. Probably yet more water leakages and frequent digging up of the local roads to massively increase the facilities [sewage, water, electricity, gas, cable etc] all of which seem to be done separately without any</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					co-ordination. It would be grossly irresponsible of the Council to approve such a huge further importation of residents without providing adequate facilities in all these areas
2014/4309/P	John Sutherland	8 Parkview House 11-13 Miller Street London NW17DN	02/08/2014 14:38:55	PETITNOBJ E	<p>I wish to lodge objections to Camden to the amended proposal (85 units) on the following pertinent grounds.</p> <p>(1) density. The Galliard project will be jammed between high occupancy Carlow Street housing block and the three multi-story 'Fields' (Briarfield, etc) blocks. No parking is provided, in garage on on street, for the Galliard 85 apartment project. HS2 will remove much of what street parking there is for long periods. The approved lower density plan (i.e. 54 units) is therefore optimal.</p> <p>(2) For the voting Camden residents on the fourth floor, several with families, the new development will infringe legal 'quiet enjoyment' rights. The approved 54-unit plan is therefore optimal.</p> <p>(3) turning the existing atrium into an airshaft, with 100+ windows, and 50+ doors opening on to narrow companion ways, will create a flue, or chimney, which represents a manifest fire risk which has not been investigated. Exitage may well be inadequate, in an emergency at night, for 300 people. No large fire engine access is feasible, given the narrowness of Carlow and Miller Streets and no frontal access to either Parkview or the UCU office building. The approved 54-unit plan is therefore optimal.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4309/P	N J Thorne	Flat 8 Metro House 36 Arlington Road NW1 7HU	04/08/2014 11:21:47	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to the alteration of application 2014/2114309/P 5/P for an increase of 54 dwellings at Carlow House to 85 residential units (2014/4309/P).</p> <p>The loss of privacy and increased disturbance that creation of 54 new dwellings would create will be considerably magnified by the amended plan for 85 dwellings. I live in Metro House immediately adjacent to the West face of Carlow House and the new plans include ground floor flats which look out onto our garage wall across a narrow space. This space will act as an amplification chamber resulting in increased noise disturbance for all in Metro House and those on the West face of Carlow House (including Parkview).</p> <p>More partially I am concerned about increased traffic movements. The application comes with a supporting document from ttp consulting. This is an updated copy of their report for 2014/2115/P. In section 4.7 of that document a table of person and vehicular movements from the TRAVI database provided ttp consulting with the empirical evidence to draw their conclusions. However, in the report submitted in support of 2014/4309/P section 4.7 contains person data only and there is no data for vehicular movements. Given the lack of empirical evidence it is hard to see the basis on which they assert "...it will be reasonable to assume there will be fewer trips for the residential compared to the office use..." and in any case the comparison, given the nature of the application, should be between a development of 54 residences and one of 85. (Just how relevant is this report to this application?) My view, simply from living on the street for many years is that residential properties generate deliveries of various sorts throughout the day and it is these, rather than vehicles owned by those living in the new development which will cause the extra traffic with its associated noise, pollution and danger to children.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4309/P	rob macdonald	5 Parkview House Miller Street London NW1 7DN	04/08/2014 12:46:15	OBJ	<p>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.</p> <p>Carlow House and Parkview House are one building for all intents and purposes. Parkview House is the top floor of Carlow House. They are both inter-dependent on each other. They have a common roof and supports; interconnecting doorways; shared common areas (plant room, lift rom etc) and a joint insurance policy. One could not exist without the other. To the man on the Clapham Omnibus they are one building. This makes the entity a mixed use building. Indeed we cannot buy the Freehold of the building as this is not allowed as 75% of the "building" is offices. This is not the kind of building meant to be covered by the above order. 85new 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. We reject the claims made in the submitted Traffic Report because:-The report takes a highly selective sample between 08:00 and 18:00. Traffic introduced beyond those times would definitely be greater than the status quo and would thus have more impact on the neighbouring residences.</p>
