

FLASK WALK NEIGHBOURHOOD ASSOCIATION NW3
(representing the interests of residents of Back Lane, Boades Mews, Flask Walk,
Gardnor Road, Lakis Close, Luton Terrace, Mansfield Place, Murray Terrace,
New Court and Streatley Place)

Attn Rob Tulloch
Regeneration and Planning Development
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd St
WC1H 8ND

16 January 2015

Dear Sir,

Planning Application 2014/7778/P: 6 Streatley Place NW3 JHL

I am instructed by the Committee of the Flask Walk Neighbourhood Association to object to the above application on the following grounds.

1. The proposed development is embedded in a residential neighbourhood, overlooked and bordered by many family occupied properties. It would bring a transient population of visitors with no established links with the area. Whilst many of these will be well behaved and quiet neighbours, some will be antisocial, particularly with regard to noise, with little fear of retribution as they would be gone to be replaced by others, before effective action could be taken. One has only to consider other locations of rapidly changing population to realise that this is not an irrational fear.
2. The proposal to erect a building hard up against the existing narrow pathway of Streatley Place and some two and a half stories high is completely unacceptable. The existing pathway is already a little intimidating with a high blank wall but to raise this by a further 5 metres or so will create a very uncomfortable canyon effect. In passing we would note that most of the surrounding existing buildings are incorrectly identified, New Court being called Streatley Flats, Streatley Flats called Streatley Cottages, 5A Back Lane allocated to Streatley place, etc. One must wonder whether such cavalier attention to addresses reflects a similar attitude to residents and the absence of the consultation claimed.
3. The existing retaining wall is proposed to be rebuilt. It has served its purpose well over the past 150 years or so. The rebuild would appear to be required to support the new structure. If the proposed structure were set back and founded on piles one wonders whether the existing wall, part of the setting of the listed buildings and possibly included in the listing, would need to be demolished. Again, no thought appears to have been given to the effect of this domination on the setting of New Court, a Grade II listed building, and on its residents, contrary to the requirements of English Heritage. The developers may not know that the New Court flats, deliberately spaced apart in separate blocks, represent one of the earliest examples of social housing, specifically designed to provide less well off residents with healthy living conditions, yet this proposal is one step back from the conditions achieved 150 years

ago. Any development on this site must have regard to its neighbours by being set back from each of these two boundaries.

4. We note that Streatley Flats, the actual building on the opposite side of Streatley Place, are not even marked on the Proposed Site Plan. These flats will be overpowered by the front wall of the proposed development and clearly have been given scant regard.

5. Turning to associated matters referred to in the Planning Considerations we are amazed at, as well as opposed to, the suggestion that Boades Mews (Boades Mews on the application, can they not get a single local name correct?) should be used as a site compound. The Mews is many metres below the lowest part of the proposed building. All materials would have to be brought up a set of steps and along Streatley Place, past New End School and in front of private houses having this alleyway as their sole access. This is a dangerous route, even outside of school hours. Access should be constrained to entry from the top of Back Lane, slightly uphill from and much closer to the site, and all site compound requirements kept to within the site, by no means impractical, possibly with access from Heath Street into Back lane permitted to reduce the impact of construction traffic on Flask Walk. Once again we see a cavalier attitude to anything other than the convenience of the developers.

6. We do not comment on the detailed architecture of the proposal as we reserve our position to provide input on these matters once the main points of contention have been addressed and a revised proposal submitted. We accept that some development of the site is both inevitable and, if appropriate, desirable, but we feel very strongly that this hotel/hostel is not the right solution here.

Yours truly



Mark Nevard, committee member, FWNA
71 Flask Walk London NW3 1ET