

**15 Evangelist Road  
London NW5 1UA**



Rob Tulloch  
Regeneration and Planning  
Development Management  
London Borough of Camden  
Town Hall  
Argyle Street  
London WC1H 8ND

26 August 2014

Dear Rob Tulloch

**Re: Planning Application 1-8 College Yard, London NW5 1NX; No. 2014/5054/P;  
related applications: 2013/1873/P, 2012/6468/P and 2010/0550/P**

We are writing concerning the above planning application. We are owners of a property directly affected by the proposed demolition of the existing one-storey warehouse building and construction of a three-storey building (including basement) with roof terraces comprising 4 mews houses and 2 flats. The building borders our garden.

First, please note that, in the submitted Design and Access statement, it is incorrect to refer to Evangelist Road Residents' Association. Wherever the words 'Evangelist Road Residents' Association' appear, please substitute 'local residents'. Any views referred to are those of the local residents not the Evangelist Road Residents' Association. I have informed the planning consultant of this error on many occasions but it has not been noted.

In principle we welcome the concept of mews houses for this constrained site. It is much more suitable for this location than the previous schemes.

**Overlooking**

After discussions with the developers, and from our particular perspective at 15 Evangelist Road, we are satisfied that, subject to the conditions below, we would not be overlooked. The conditions are as follows:

- The retention of the existing building's wall on our elevation except for the top 80cm (but see comment below).
- The wood-faced box windows face south.
- The roof terraces are set back in the centre of the building and are within the roof structure.

With regard to the reduction of 80cm to the existing wall there seems to be a discrepancy between drawings 4129/P/030A, 4129/DA/021A and 4129/P/023B when indicating the height of the retained wall. This needs to be clarified.

However, there are problems with overlooking further down Evangelist Road. For example, the garden of no. 7, on the plans currently submitted, will suffer unacceptable overlooking from the first-floor patio to apartment unit 2 (see drawing 4129/P/042). We feel this needs to be addressed further before any decisions are taken.

#### **Noise disturbance**

After further discussion with the developer (email 21 August), although there will be increased noise disturbance from the outdoor spaces and opening windows, from our perspective, subject to the measures agreed below, we consider the levels to be within acceptable limits.

- The change from fully opening glass roofs to the winter gardens at the lower ground floor level to a sliding half open sun roof (revised plans to be submitted by the developer).
- The use of noise reduction/absorption materials and design to all the 4 winter gardens and the open patio to apartment unit 1 (amendments to be submitted by the developer).

#### **Scale and design**

Although the building will, in parts, be higher than the existing, from our perspective we do not feel that it will have a substantial negative impact. The sensitive use of materials proposed will help the building fit in with its surroundings and should help improve the currently unattractive College Lane elevation.

#### **Daylight and sunlight report**

The report that has been submitted is incomprehensible to those who do not work in the architectural business. The developer should be asked to submit surveys window by window as has been the case in previous applications so the layman can understand the impact.

#### **Construction Management Plan**

No Construction Management Plan has been submitted. This is a serious oversight. Given the constrained nature of the site, the potentially dangerous access from Highgate Road, the inclusion of a basement and the necessity for businesses in the Yard to continue operating during construction, it is essential that a plan be submitted before any decision is taken, as in previous applications.

It is also important that neighbours affected are given the opportunity to comment further on this before any decision is taken. Please will you assure us of this?

#### **Parking**

The area is already over parked and we would expect the Council to ensure that the development would be car-free given there is no on-site parking provision.

#### **Conclusion**

Subject to the above points being satisfactorily addressed, we would not, in principle, object to the application.

We would be grateful if you would notify of us the committee date.

Yours sincerely

Belinda and Mark Wakefield