

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7654/P	Barbara Brown	34 Ravenshaw Street London NW6 1NW	27/01/2015 20:32:38	OBJ	<p>Dear Mr Yeung</p> <p>I live at and own 34 Ravenshaw Street. I am therefore one of the main local residents directly affected by any proposed redevelopment of the existing vehicle repair and MOT centre located at what is known as 1a Glastonbury Street. Along with my neighbours I have therefore considered carefully the redevelopment proposed by Cape Holdings Ltd, Council Reference 2014/7654/P, against site-specific circumstances and relevant policy guidance contained within the LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies Document, together with the National Planning Policy Framework and the London Plan As a collective group, we have also been assisted by a Planning Consultant (Sean Silk of Blake Morgan, copied), a Chartered Surveyor (Ms Jenny Norwood of Otway Norwood Ltd), a Building Surveyor (Mike McGill), and by my son (Nick Brown B.A.; Dip. Arch) who designed my house in 1992, and managed the construction and who will be submitting his own view on the proposal. On the basis of this detailed review I write to OBJECT to the redevelopment proposed, for the reasons set out below.</p> <p>1. Loss of Employment. The Proposal seeks to demolish and redevelop a site which is used as a vehicle repair and MOT centre. This has been in existence and serving the needs of the local area for a considerable period of time. The loss of such a site and premises is contrary to Policy CS18 and associated supporting text at paragraphs 8.10 - 8.14, and the Council's 2008 Employment Land Review. These all require such sites and premises to be safeguarded, making clear that demand for such sites and premises far exceeds supply. This is carried forward in Policy DP13 which states that the Council "...will retain land and buildings that are suitable for continued business use and will resist change of use to non-business..." Policy DP13 goes on to provide two tests against which to assess any such potential loss. The proposal fails to meet either of these tests, noting that the Applicant and the Howe Change of Use Report fail to demonstrate satisfactorily that: (1) the site or building is unsuitable for its existing business use (noting that the existing occupant remains and is happy to do so for many years to come); and (2) following full exploration over an appropriate period of time (usually in excess of 18 months), there is not even a possibility of retaining, re-using or redeveloping the site or building for a similar or alternative business use. EVEN IF the Applicant managed to satisfy these tests following a period of robust and active marketing, then Policy DP13 requires a light industrial use to be retained on the site, of a similar or increased floor-space to that lost. Finally, the proposal also fails Policy DP2 given that the site is not "...underused or vacant..." and redevelopment fails to "...take into account any other uses that are needed on the site..." Any such unjustified loss of a local light industrial facility and associated jobs is therefore wholly unacceptable and contrary to Policies CS8, DP13 and DP2.</p> <p>2. Scale, Bulk, Massing and Height. The proposal is in effect a 5-storey building, comprising a basement, sub-ground floor, first floor, second floor and then roof-space. The Council's response to the Applicant's pre-application submission (Council Reference 2014/2023/PRE) makes abundantly clear that the building height must be limited to and no higher than that of its neighbour, 1 Glastonbury Street. Moreover and as is self-evident from a visit to the site, that anything more than a ground floor redevelopment, possibly to include some element of basement space, is likely to be unacceptable on several grounds. For example, in relation to height, it states that, for a proposal of less height than now proposed, it would be "...overly large and at odds with the [Glastonbury Street] terrace..." which</p>

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**

**Comment:**    **Response:**

cannot be justified in terms of design or amenity. Moreover and exacerbated from the original submission, the increased height shown to maximise dwelling size will create an unacceptable "tower" effect which is totally incongruous in the street. It will result in an unacceptable loss of daylight and, albeit to a lesser extent, loss of sunlight. It will also be overbearing and cause a real and perceived sense of enclosure, overlooking and loss of privacy to residents to the rear of the property, notwithstanding their oblique juxtaposition. The clear attempt to fit a square shape into a triangular space has resulted in the large and dominating building forced right up the party wall with four neighbouring properties to the rear. Finally, there will be an issue associated with rights to light. This is a matter to be considered further in the event that the Council is minded to approve the proposal. As such, the proposal fails to meet the requirements of CPG1, Policies CS6 and CS14, failing to respect the local context and character of the surrounding area.

3. Design and Streetscene. As noted in the Council's pre-application advice the rear and flank elevations of the proposal are visible from the street as well as the front elevation. The design of the facade in Glastonbury Street is a hybrid composition, attempting to imitate the fenestration of other houses in the row and then, rather oddly, reproducing the size and shape of the garage doors. Together with the overall design and massing, these elevations do not "...respect the traditional uniform pattern of fenestration to the streetscene..." This fails to meet the requirements of Policy CS14, being unattractive and not the highest standard of design. It also fails to meet Policy DP24, given that it fails to provide "...visually interesting frontages at street level...", alongside failings in terms of amenity space and accessibility (below), collectively meaning a failure to comply with the requirements of CPG1.

4. Future Occupant Amenity. The amenity of future residents of the proposal will be poor, by reason of the cramped internal design and layout, restricted vertical accessibility and ill-considered inter-relationship between the rooms and their location within the structure, particularly provision of a bathroom at 3rd floor/roof level and bedrooms within the basement area. Not only does this layout fail to meet lifetime homes standards and thus Policy DP6 and Policy DP24 in terms of substandard accessibility, it fails to meet Policy DP26 given that it is not an "...acceptable standard of accommodation in terms of internal arrangements; dwelling and room sizes and amenity space; facilities for the storage, recycling and disposal of waste; and outdoor space for private or communal amenity space..." The proposal also fails to provide 15sqm of amenity space as required under CPG6, with the limited space provided also being qualitatively unacceptable by reason of its shape, the underground use and its street-side location.

5. Neighbour Amenity. The proposal will have significant implications for the neighbouring properties at 1 Glastonbury Street and those residing on Ravenshaw Street to the rear. These will be adverse and harmful to resident amenity. It is noted that, under Policy DP26, the Council will "...protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity...", taking into account, inter alia, "...visual privacy an overlooking; overshadowing and outlook; sunlight, daylight and artificial light levels..." As clearly demonstrated from a visit to the properties affected, the proposal will result in reduced daylight and, albeit to a lesser extent due to orientation/aspect, sunlight. There will also be a significant real and perceived reduction in outlook, with an enhanced sense of overlooking and loss of privacy. The proposal will also have a significant overbearing effect on local residents to the rear. As such, the proposal is clearly contrary to Policy DP26.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7654/P	John zenkner	43 ravenshaw street	26/01/2015 14:03:46	APP	<p>6. Basement. The proposal includes the creation of a new basement. The Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) prepared fails to meet policy requirements contained within Policy DP27 and CPG4, given that: (1) the proposal does not provide a ground floor that is 300mm above ground level as required but rather is below this level and thus fails to meet flooding requirements; (2) the BIA does not demonstrate adequately maintaining the structural stability of 1 Glastonbury Street or the rear boundary wall; (3) the basement will harm the amenity of neighbours and prevent the creation of usable amenity space, with insufficient soil depth and landscaping; (4) the proposal fails to put in place a form of independent verification for its claims; and (5) the light-wells will harm the appearance and setting of the property and established character of the surrounding area.</p> <p>I trust that these comments are helpful, setting out the concerns held by me and my neighbours. Aside from it being a shame to lose a valued local employment opportunity, I can see some benefits to the redevelopment of the site. However, in order to be successful in taking into account neighbouring properties and other site-specific constraints, this would need to be kept to ground and basement levels, possibly with a subservient element of development at first floor level if this can be designed appropriately, without causing harm to the amenity of residents to the rear.</p> <p>Thank you. May I ask please that these concerns are taken into account fully when considering the application. Perhaps unlikely, given your pre-application advice but in the event that you are minded to consider approving the application I would ask please that it be reported to committee. I would also ask to be kept informed as matters progress.</p> <p>Many thanks</p> <p>I am not happy to see the destruction of a small business that offers such good service to myself and the community. The idea to replace this service (with a very small footprint) for a residential home appears to be based only on profit without regard to the existing community. Development taking 'shoe box' space to create over-expensive and miserable dwellings should not be allowed to destroy amenities and services well established in this community.</p> <p>The construction does not only destroy a valid and needed service but proposes to build an out of character blot in this area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7654/P	Michael and Julia Simkins	36 ravenshaw street West Hampstead London NW6 1NW	27/01/2015 10:41:34	COMMEMP ER	<p>FAO Mr Raymond Yeung – LOCAL RESIDENT OBJECTION. Re Application No: 2014/7654/P Address of site: 1A Glastonbury Street, London NW6 1QJ</p> <p>This objection concerns the application for change of use and redevelopment of site, including works of excavation, to provide a 3 storey dwelling with basement (1 X 3 bed) dwelling house (following the demolition of commercial garage premises).</p> <p>AGENT: Matthew Cummings of Etc Design, 62 Mountview Rd, London N4 4JR APPLICANT: Mr Brian Taitz of Cape Property Holdings Ltd, 16 Kirby Street, London EC1N 8TS LOCAL RESIDENT CONSULTEE: Michael Simkins &amp; Julia Simkins (Deakin). CONSULTEE ADDRESS: 36 Ravenshaw Street, London NW6 1NW</p> <p>We have read and studied this proposed development in consultation with Mr Sean Silk MRTPI Planning Consultant at Blake Morgan.</p> <p>We have lived at 36 Ravenshaw St since 2001 and are very directly affected by the above planning proposal. Together with our planning consultant, Chartered Surveyor Ms Jennie Norwood of Otway Norwood Ltd, we have examined relevant policy guidance from the LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies document, as well as reflecting upon the National Planning Policy Framework and The London Plan.</p> <p>Our property shares a boundary with the garage at 1 A Glastonbury St, and having studied the proposal and all accompanying documents, we will be seriously impacted by this development, mainly due to its mass, volume, height and proximity. We wish therefore to lodge the following objections:</p> <p>1. We strongly object to the scale, bulking, mass and height.</p> <p>The plans indicate what would in effect be a 5 storey building; i.e. – basement, sub ground floor, first floor, second floor and bathroom in the roof space. This means that our property, along with several adjoining houses, will be dominated by a brick wall over 9 metres in height at points. This would be significantly overbearing and give a real and perceived sense of enclosure.</p> <p>The new wall would be within 10.5 metres of our rear elevation windows, and within 5.5 metres of our long-established kitchen extension. As the basement excavation is extensive, this proximity is thus doubly worrying.</p> <p>We believe that the full height of the wall will inundate and overshadow our eastern boundary by approximately 1.5 metres, and give an incongruous, inappropriate, asymmetric feel, visually bisecting our small walled garden in two.</p> <p>This end of the elevation has been exclusively designed to house a rain pipe. This creates a very narrow apex, and would make the pipework both difficult to maintain and impractical if built in brick.</p> <p>The proposed overall height of the south elevation will also severely impact our skyline, reducing daylight and much reduce our view of the sky.</p> <p>The initial pre-application proposal by Mr. Taitz to build two flats on this site was robustly and soundly rejected by Camden Council. Camden Council stated that this suggested building – of lesser height than the one now being proposed – was deemed “overly large and at odds with the Glastonbury St terrace.” Thus we strongly object to the top floor proposal (which houses solely a bathing facility), as the plans already provide for a bathroom and two toilets on this small site. There is absolutely no need for this additional storey of accommodation and if any proposal is to be successful this must be removed.</p> <p>This roof level also involves a dormer window (not obscure), which would overlook, albeit obliquely, the houses further down Ravenshaw St.</p>

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**

**Comment:**    **Response:**

The overall mass is far from the ‘modest dwelling’ as described by the developer in an initial email to our neighbour at number 34. In addition there will be a rights to light issue here that we and adjoining neighbours will need to address later in the process.

2. We object strongly to the excavation of a basement.

We are aware of recent problems with subsidence in at least two of the five adjacent properties in Glastonbury St.

This is an area of soft clay soil, and there is some evidence of an underground river nearby. Several houses in nearby Broomsleigh St. with small half –basements are constantly prone to flooding due to the change in the water table. We have no tradition of extensive basements in this area. If this proposal goes ahead, it will set a dangerous precedent for basements being excavated in this estate in the future. The proposed basement excavation also goes right into the tight apex at the Ravenshaw St end (i.e.: under the proposed ‘garden, which is in fact a light well). We are concerned this will cause subsidence in our own garden and thus impact the stability of our own dwelling.

Furthermore the B.I.A. prepared does not meet Policy requirements contained within Policy DP 27 and CPG 4, because: a; the proposal does not provide a ground floor that is 300 mms above ground floor level as required, but is below this level and thus does not meet flood requirements. b: The proposal fails to provide independent verification for its claims.

Any potential basement proposal must comply in every detail within BIA stipulations, and with a large provision for making good the damage to our property walls and the aesthetics thereof, in terms of planting and period brickwork. Indeed, would it not be neighbourly to build this rear elevation in consultation with the owners of houses affected, and in a material and fashion amenable to those for whom it will comprise their main view.

3. Future Occupant Amenity.

We object on grounds of ill-considered location of rooms within the structure; particularly the provision of a bathroom at 3rd floor/ roof level, and of a bedroom in the basement.

The proposal fails to provide 15 sq. metres of amenity space as required under CPG 6.

Sustainability

The proposal fails to demonstrate adequately how it will achieve at least 20% reduction in CO2 emissions as required under Policy CS 13.

In conclusion: We do not object to the change of use to allow a small residential build that gives attention to the proximity and amenities of the neighbouring dwellings. The fact that this site is at the tight apex of 2 terraces makes for a very small footprint on which to build, and a very profound impact on the surrounding enclave.

A ‘modest dwelling for one family”, in the words of Mr. Taitz, would be surely be a ground and partial first floor only, one that fits in with the scale and size of surrounding dwellings.

We welcome further discussions of our objections, and are amenable to site visit and full access to our home for further enquiry. We would also ask to be kept advised as matters progress, as well as asking you please to confirm receipt of this objection.

Please confirm your receipt of this objection

Yours, in good faith

MICHAEL SIMKINS AND JULIA DEAKIN.