

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7654/P	Janine Asserson	4 Glastonbury Steet London NW6 1QJ	02/02/2015 16:21:58	COMMNT	<p>I am very concerned about the proposed re-development of 1A Glastonbury Street, and would like to submit my objections as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The current Garage and MOT Repair Centre services many local residents, and will be a real loss to the landscape of the street. The boys are always around, and I am sure their constant presence plays a significant part in keeping crime down. They have built up a good business and following, and add a sense of security to all of us. Apart from this, I understand that Camden has an obligation to encourage small businesses. Is this not then contrary to Camden's principles to close them down?2. If redevelopment HAS to happen, my real concern is the basement. Myself and No. 5 Glastonbury suffered severe subsidence in 2000, and had to relocate while major underpinning took place. I know No. 3 is currently being monitored for subsidence, so to start excavating at no. 1A appears to be taking a major risk to the safety of all the surrounding properties. The whole area is on a very precarious slope, the soil is soft, and any movement could have major repercussions. Apart from this, basements are NOT a feature of houses in this small enclave of NW6, and I am sure that most local residents will be very unhappy about it, even though they have not formally 'objected' on-line. <p>I am also concerned that the property is totally 'in keeping' with the environment, and surrounding properties. To put up a 4 story house on this site seems very excessive, and I am sure could be 'exercised' with a little more 'sensitivity' for the local, loyal and concerned residents.</p> <p>Please keep me informed as matters progress. Thank you.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7654/P	nick brown	34 ravenshaw street london NW6 1NW	02/02/2015 19:50:51	OBJ	re-submitted objection - pasted submission did not seem to include include bold page formatting, so replaced with caps for clarity...

I am writing to OBJECT to the proposal for 1a Glastonbury Street.

Case no: 2014/7654/P
For the attention of Mr Yeung

I regularly stay with my mother at 34 Ravenshaw Street when I work in London so it seems appropriate to write to you now. 1992 was the last time I was in touch with Camden Planning and Building Control when I submitted drawings to refurbish no.34 from top to bottom. My training is in architecture and I continue to work in property in London. I have printed all the application drawings and looked at them carefully with a UK registered architect and I'm keen to share the thoughts I have on this application and the thoughts I have for a more acceptable alternative in the hope that developer, architect, neighbours and council can all be happy with the outcome at 1a. Currently all the neighbours to 1a are very unhappy with the application and the depth of their feeling and their combined capability should in no way be underestimated.

THIS PROPOSAL IS POORLY DESIGNED

Care has been taken in presenting the drawings. Despite this the design itself is poor. I would like to look at some of the most pressing examples of poor design so that they can be properly addressed and the application re-submitted to avoid the very regrettable possibility that the proposal is actually built! Regrettable for any possible future occupants and neighbours alike.

THIS DESIGN IS POOR DESPITE A REVISION AFTER A PRE-APPLICATION SUBMISSION

A larger proposal has already been presented and was rejected with numerous suggestions made by Camden. Looking at the current application there has been an attempt to incorporate Camden's suggestions. However just because an attempt has been made to incorporate these suggestions and that this is a second attempt this is not necessarily enough in itself. Because of poor design this proposal should be considered a work in progress at an unresolved stage.

HOWEVER CONTAINED IN THIS PROPOSAL ARE SOME POTENTIALLY GOOD PARTS WHICH COULD BE DEVELOPED TO MAKE A DESIGN WORTH SUPPORTING

However because the application has some potentially good parts which could be developed into something worthwhile I am hopeful that a re-submission will be made and it will be a proposal worthy of support.

CHANGE OF USE IN PRINCIPLE IS CURRENTLY DEEMED UNACCEPTABLE

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

We all object to the loss of employment of the mechanic currently running a useful community business at 1a. In addition to this, in terms of change of use we would prefer the status quo to remain in place. However, if the change of use has to proceed, and if there is evidence of adequate adaptation to neighbours' requirements for amenity, and reduction of the mass and scale of the project, there might be the possibility of a dwelling place which is in keeping with its environment, architectural and social.

SITE CONSTRAINTS - SITE SITS AT THE SHARP END OF A TRIANGULAR BLOCK
HISTORICALLY LEFT UNBUILT HELPING TO MAINTAIN THE AMENITY OF THE GARDEN
SIDE TO RAVENSHAW STREET

The shape and size of the buildings on Glastonbury street recognise the constraints of being at the sharp end of a triangular block. No.1 Glastonbury Street is double fronted and less deep than the rest of the terrace so it keeps a distance from the garden side of the houses on Ravenshaw Street, respecting their amenity space. To the west of no1 is the triangular single story shed previously not considered suitable for a house (site of the proposal).

PROPOSAL FAILS TO CONSIDER THE GARDEN SIDE OF THE HOUSES OR RAVENSHAW
STREET

Note that while the site's use might change, its proximity to its neighbours remains the same. This proposal shows a building backing directly onto the gardens of the houses on Ravenshaw Street whilst none of the other houses on Glastonbury Street do this. The amenity and enjoyment to the garden sides to Ravenshaw Street would be substantially harmed if the current proposal was built. This is not acceptable.

BASEMENT AND COURTYARD (KEY PARTS TO A WORTHWHILE PROPOSAL) ARE NOT
USED TO ANYTHING LIKE THEIR PROPER POTENTIAL

This proposal largely fails to recognise the nature and constraints of the site it sits on. However contained within the proposal is the courtyard and the basement which are the two key parts of the proposal which if considered a little more could completely transform this proposal into something entirely worthwhile for future occupant and neighbours alike.

SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS....

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

GROUND FLOOR COURTYARD BECOMES SUNKEN COURTYARD GARDEN

The courtyard garden is the key to a good design and could be made far more effective by having a sunken courtyard garden at basement level instead of at ground floor level as shown. With a sunken courtyard garden the basement has a garden to look at and good natural light making good quality space at this level instead of the very poor quality space as currently proposed. With thoughtful planting the sunken garden would also be enjoyed by the living area at ground floor. Crucial to the excavation of a basement, is adherence to the highest standards of safety and design, so that all surroundings properties are protected from subsidence and damage.

DOUBLE BEDROOM AND BATHROOM NEXT TO SUNKEN GARDEN COURTYARD

The proposed accommodation for the basement could be replaced with a double bedroom and bathroom which look onto the garden and get far more light than is shown in the current application. In this way, providing quality space. the bedroom and bathroom can now use the same size area as the living area above instead of the considerably smaller first floor bedroom.

GROUND FLOOR LIVING AREA WITH SLOPED CEILING, EXTENSIVE ROOF LIGHTS AND HIGH FLOOR TO CEILING HEIGHT

With the main bedroom and bathroom placed next to the sunken garden courtyard there is no longer any need to build first and second floors. Indeed with the building stopping at ground floor the ceiling would no longer need to be flat and could have a far greater area used for roof lights. The living area would be lighter and feel bigger because of the increased floor to ceiling. becoming a far better space than the one proposed.

ENTRANCE THROUGH COURTYARD

With balcony access along the north side of the courtyard at ground floor level to the street the proposed front door could be moved to the courtyard wall onto Glastonbury Street allowing better planning of the living accommodation. This would significantly increase the quality and size of the ground floor living area.

ONE FLIGHT OF STAIRS

Only one flight of stairs is needed compared to the three flights used to access diminishing area and poorly planned space shown in the application.

EXAMPLES OF POOR DESIGN IN THE CURRENT APPLICATION WHICH CAN BE DROPPED IF THE ABOVE IS ADOPTED...

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

Comment: **Response:**

BASEMENT - TWO ROOMS LABELLED "BEDROOMS" ARE SMALL WITH POOR VENTILATION WITH NO ADEQUATE MEANS OF ESCAPE

Despite the labels on the drawings the proposal is essentially a one bedroom house. This is because it's very hard to imagine that the two rooms in the basement labelled "single bedroom" could really be anything other than storage. They are not generous in size and the small light-well labelled "courtyard" will do little to provide natural light or cross ventilation. If built these rooms will be small dark spaces, both very far from good design. It is also questionable whether escaping from these rooms in the event of a fire through another room labelled "TV/games-room" is acceptable as a means of emergency exit. I understand they would be considered inner rooms which is not acceptable room planning by your colleagues in building control. This is also poor design.

BASEMENT - ROOM LABELLED "TV/GAMESROOM" - THIS HAS VIRTUALLY NO NATURAL LIGHT

The room labelled "TV/gamesroom" has only a small glass ceiling panel next to window in the ground floor which is next to a small outside space labelled "light-well". This is indeed a very circuitous route for lighting an interior. This room if built would have even less light than the other rooms in the basement. This is also poor design. Why go to the all the trouble and expense to build a basement and then design space within it of such low quality? This should not be encouraged.

GLASTONBURY STREET (NORTH FACING) - "SQUARE-PEG-ROUND-HOLE" OR TRIANGULAR PLAN WITH A DOUBLE FRONTED STYLE FACADE

While the proposal attempts to consider its Glastonbury Street neighbours in the way the facade is similar to no1 this has been at the sheer neglect of the south west elevation facing gardens of the houses of Ravenshaw Street. The proposal essentially has two elevations but the south-west facing elevation presents a prison wall of bricks to its neighbours. This is unacceptable. This is very poor design indeed.

BATHROOM DORMER WINDOW - OVERLOOKING

The dormer window in the bathroom overlooks the rear of the buildings on Ravenshaw Street. It is labelled obscured glass but I have seen many examples where the glass is subsequently made clear causing further upset and in many cases remains clear. This is poor design and is unacceptable.

CONCEALED DOWNPIPE - FURTHER NEGLECT OF ELEVATION FACING GARDEN SIDE OF RAVENSHAW STREET

Concealing the down-pipe (from the roof) in the wall causes a great deal more wall to be built and presented to the garden side of Ravenshaw Street. Once again only the North elevation is considered at the neglect of the elevation facing the garden side of Ravenshaw Street.

FIRST FLOOR BEDROOM SUFFERS FROM AN AWKWARD TRIANGULAR SHAPED PLAN

The courtyard garden successfully takes away the sharp end of the site in the planning of the living area, making the living space more square and more usable and of course providing the garden amenity space and light into the living area. However the bedroom on the first floor does not get the benefit and is an awkward space to plan.

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

I strongly object to the application for the reasons I have given above but at the same time I am hopeful that through sensible discussion a fresh submission can be made which is acceptable to all concerned. If any of the suggestions made here are of any interest then feel free to contact me to discuss further, I would be very happy to make a contribution of ideas. If the full potential of the basement and courtyard are allowed to develop (safely and with strict adherence to guidelines) then head-to-head this is a far superior design to the one currently submitted which already contains the basement and courtyard in principle. In addition there are big savings to be made in building costs and a huge barrage of objection from neighbours could potentially be replaced with support.

Kind Regards, Nick Brown

07973 145 636
nick.brown@internada.com

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7654/P	nick brown	34 ravenshaw street london nw6 1nw	02/02/2015 19:17:46	OBJ	<p>I am writing to OBJECT to the proposal for 1a Glastonbury Street.</p> <p>Case no: 2014/7654/P For the attention of Mr Yeung</p> <p>I regularly stay with my mother at 34 Ravenshaw Street when I work in London so it seems appropriate to write to you now. 1992 was the last time I was in touch with Camden Planning and Building Control when I submitted drawings to refurbish no.34 from top to bottom. My training is in architecture and I continue to work in property in London. I have printed all the application drawings and looked at them carefully with a UK registered architect and I'm keen to share the thoughts I have on this application and the thoughts I have for a more acceptable alternative in the hope that developer, architect, neighbours and council can all be happy with the outcome at 1a. Currently all the neighbours to 1a are very unhappy with the application and the depth of their feeling and their combined capability should in no way be underestimated.</p> <p>This proposal is a poor design Care has been taken in presenting the drawings. Despite this the design itself is poor. I would like to look at some of the most pressing examples of poor design so that they can be properly addressed and the application re-submitted to avoid the very regrettable possibility that the proposal is actually built! Regrettable for any possible future occupants and neighbours alike.</p> <p>This design is poor despite a revision after a pre-application submission A larger proposal has already been presented and was rejected with numerous suggestions made by Camden. Looking at the current application there has been an attempt to incorporate Camden's suggestions. However just because an attempt has been made to incorporate these suggestions and that this is a second attempt this is not necessarily enough in itself. Because of poor design this proposal should be considered a work in progress at an unresolved stage.</p> <p>However contained in this proposal are some potentially good parts which could be developed to make a design worth supporting However because the application has some potentially good parts which could be developed into something worthwhile I am hopeful that a re-submission will be made and it will be a proposal worthy of support.</p> <p>Change of use in principle is currently deemed unacceptable. We all object to the loss of employment of the mechanic currently running a useful community business at 1a. In addition to this, in terms of change of use we would prefer the status quo to remain in place. However, if the change of use has to proceed, and if there is evidence of adequate adaptation to neighbours' requirements for amenity, and reduction of the mass and scale of the project, there might be the possibility of a dwelling place which is in keeping with its environment, architectural and social.</p>

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

Site constraints - site sits at the sharp end of a triangular block historically left unbuilt helping to maintain the amenity of the garden side to Ravenshaw street

The shape and size of the buildings on Glastonbury street recognise the constraints of being at the sharp end of a triangular block. No.1 Glastonbury Street is double fronted and less deep than the rest of the terrace so it keeps a distance from the garden side of the houses on Ravenshaw Street, respecting their amenity space. To the west of no1 is the triangular single story shed previously not considered suitable for a house (site of the proposal).

Proposal fails to consider the garden side of the houses of Ravenshaw Street

Note that while the site's use might change, its proximity to its neighbours remains the same. This proposal shows a building backing directly onto the gardens of the houses on Ravenshaw Street whilst none of the other houses on Glastonbury Street do this. The amenity and enjoyment to the garden sides to Ravenshaw Street would be substantially harmed if the current proposal was built. This is not acceptable.

Basement and courtyard (key parts to a worthwhile proposal) are not used to anything like their proper potential

This proposal largely fails to recognise the nature and constraints of the site it sits on. However contained within the proposal is the courtyard and the basement which are the two key parts of the proposal which if considered a little more could completely transform this proposal into something entirely worthwhile for future occupant and neighbours alike.

Suggested amendments...

Ground floor courtyard garden becomes sunken courtyard garden.

The courtyard garden is the key to a good design and could be made far more effective by having a sunken courtyard garden at basement level instead of at ground floor level as shown. With a sunken courtyard garden the basement has a garden to look at and good natural light making good quality space at this level instead of the very poor quality space as currently proposed. With thoughtful planting the sunken garden would also be enjoyed by the living area at ground floor.

Crucial to the excavation of a basement, is adherence to the highest standards of safety and design, so that all surroundings properties are protected from subsidence and damage.

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

Comment: **Response:**

Double bedroom and bathroom next to sunken garden courtyard.

The proposed accommodation for the basement could be replaced with a double bedroom and bathroom which look onto the garden and get far more light than is shown in the current application. In this way, providing quality space. the bedroom and bathroom can now use the same size area as the living area above instead of the considerably smaller first floor bedroom.

Ground floor living area with sloped ceiling, extensive roof lights and high floor to ceiling heights
With the main bedroom and bathroom placed next to the sunken garden courtyard there is no longer any need to build first and second floors. Indeed with the building stopping at ground floor the ceiling would no longer need to be flat and could have a far greater area used for roof lights. The living area would be lighter and feel bigger because of the increased floor to ceiling. becoming a far better space than the one proposed.

Entrance through courtyard

With balcony access along the north side of the courtyard at ground floor level to the street the proposed front door could be moved to the courtyard wall onto Glastonbury Street allowing better planning of the living accommodation. This would significantly increase the quality and size of the ground floor living area.

One flight of stairs

Only one flight of stairs is needed compared to the three flights used to access diminishing area and poorly planned space shown in the application.

Examples of poor design in the current application which can be dropped if the above is adopted...

Basement - two rooms labelled "bedrooms" are small with poor light and poor ventilation with no adequate means of escape

Despite the labels on the drawings the proposal is essentially a one bedroom house. This is because it's very hard to imagine that the two rooms in the basement labelled "single bedroom" could really be anything other than storage. They are not generous in size and the small light-well labelled "courtyard" will do little to provide natural light or cross ventilation. If built these rooms will be small dark spaces, both very far from good design. It is also questionable whether escaping from these rooms in the event of a fire through another room labelled "TV/games-room" is acceptable as a means of emergency exit. I understand they would be considered inner rooms which is not acceptable room planning by your colleagues in building control. This is also poor design.

Basement - room labelled "TV/gamesroom" - this has virtually no natural light.

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

Comment: **Response:**

The room labelled "TV/gamesroom" has only a small glass ceiling panel next to window in the ground floor which is next to a small outside space labelled "light-well". This is indeed a very circuitous route for lighting an interior. This room if built would have even less light than the other rooms in the basement. This is also poor design. Why go to all the trouble and expense to build a basement and then design space within it of such low quality? This should not be encouraged.

Glastonbury street (north facing) elevation - "square-peg-round-hole" or triangular plan with a double fronted style facade

While the proposal attempts to consider its Glastonbury Street neighbours in the way the facade is similar to no1 this has been at the sheer neglect of the south west elevation facing gardens of the houses of Ravenshaw Street. The proposal essentially has two elevations but the south-west facing elevation presents a prison wall of bricks to its neighbours. This is unacceptable. This is very poor design indeed.

Bathroom dormer window - overlooking

The dormer window in the bathroom overlooks the rear of the buildings on Ravenshaw Street. It is labelled obscured glass but I have seen many examples where the glass is subsequently made clear causing further upset and in many cases remains clear. This is poor design and is unacceptable.

Concealed downpipe - further neglect of elevation facing garden side of Ravenshaw Street

Concealing the down-pipe (from the roof) in the wall causes a great deal more wall to be built and presented to the garden side of Ravenshaw Street. Once again only the North elevation is considered at the neglect of the elevation facing the garden side of Ravenshaw Street.

First floor bedroom suffers from an awkward triangular shape to plan

The courtyard garden successfully takes away the sharp end of the site in the planning of the living area, making the living space more square and more usable and of course providing the garden amenity space and light into the living area. However the bedroom on the first floor does not get the benefit and is an awkward space to plan.

I strongly object to the application for the reasons I have given above but at the same time I am hopeful that through sensible discussion a fresh submission can be made which is acceptable to all concerned. If any of the suggestions made here are of any interest then feel free to contact me to discuss further, I would be very happy to make a contribution of ideas. If the full potential of the basement and courtyard are allowed to develop (safely and with strict adherence to guidelines) then head-to-head this is a far superior design to the one currently submitted which already contains the basement and courtyard in principle. In addition there are big savings to be made in building costs and a huge barrage of objection from neighbours could potentially be replaced with support.

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

Kind Regards, Nick Brown

07973 145 636
nick.brown@internada.com

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7654/P	Benjamin Judah	38 Ravenshaw Street London NW6 1NW	02/02/2015 14:08:34	OBJEMAIL	<p>As the owner of 38 Ravenshaw Street London NW6 1NW which abuts the site to the rear, I am well familiar with the specifics of the site and thus well qualified to assess the proposed development's impact a) on the surrounding area in general, and b) on neighbour amenity for Nos. 34-42 Ravenshaw Street specifically. Moreover I have sought the advice of a professional planning consultant (Mr Sean Silk of Blake Morgan LLP), who has assessed the proposed scheme's degree of compliance with relevant policy guidance. As a result I find myself compelled to OBJECT to the scheme first and foremost on the grounds of (1) neighbour amenity, but also (2) the proposed basement, (3) change of use/loss of employment, (4) future occupant amenity, and (5) non-compliance with building regulations.</p> <p>1. Neighbour Amenity. The proposal will have a radically overbearing effect on local residents to the rear in Nos. 34-42 Ravenshaw Street. My property at No 38 and the adjacent one at No 40 will be most severely affected, with the proposal's rear elevation consisting of a massive brick wall reaching approximately 8m in height and spanning almost the entire width of the two gardens a mere 5.5m from the rear of the two houses. An estimated 1m of width on the left of the rear elevation is caused by the recessing of the downpipe for the 1st floor front guttering, while on the right an estimated 1.5m is the result of an overhang to the back of the first floor (presumably to make space to accommodate the WC shown on the plans). In other words, non-essential design features account for a full 2.5m of 8m of width of the rear elevation. Policy DP26 obliges the Council to "...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 and overlooking; overshadowing and outlook; sunlight, daylight and artificial light levels..." As such, the proposal is clearly contrary to Policy DP26. As the owner of No 38 Ravenshaw, I cannot emphasize enough the radically detrimental impact that the proposal would have on the outlook to the rear of Nos. 34-42 Ravenshaw Street, and I urge a Council planning officer to make an on-site inspection to assess the same with his/her own eyes, for which purpose I will be glad to grant access to my property.</p> <p>On the same subject of neighbour amenity, planning consultant Sean Silk notes: [the scheme as proposed]... 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. Finally, there will also be an issue associated with rights to light, 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.</p> <p>2. Basement. The proposal includes the creation of a new basement, but in the opinion of planning consultant Sean Silk, the Applicant's Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) is flawed: ...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...</p> <p>When I bought 38 Ravenshaw Street in 2003, I was advised by my surveyor that: "Evidence of past structural subsidence, emanating from foundation level, is visible to this building [...] This movement emanates from the building's location upon a clay-based subsoil, which is susceptible to shrinkage during periods of prolonged dry weather, a factor aggravated by an anticipated nominal size and depth</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>of foundation support."</p> <p>It has been brought to my attention that three of the five houses on Glastonbury Street have required underpinning works over the last ten years, a fact that would seem to bear out the concerns of my surveyor. Given all of the above, I have serious concerns about the possible impact that excavation works of the scale proposed might have on the structural integrity of the surrounding houses, mine included.</p> <p>3. Change of use/loss of Employment. I myself, along with many local people I know, are satisfied clients of the car repair garage that proposal seeks to demolish. I object to the destruction of a successful and valued local business, the loss of employment that this entails as well as the homogenization of the neighbourhood into a purely residential pocket. Moreover, in the opinion of planning consultant Sean Silk, the proposed change of use directly contradicts a whole swathe of Council policies:</p> <p>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>In a letter dated 26 January 2012 on the subject of the sale by the Council of 1A Glastonbury Street, the Development Manager of the Camden Council's Regeneration team Colin Barns wrote:</p> <p>The option of converting the site to residential use has been considered, but due to the size of the site the Council believes that it would not provide accommodation of sufficient size or quality to justify this option.</p> <p>If the Council's regeneration team was of such an opinion in 2012, then why now is the Planning Department even open to considering a residential development on the site?</p> <p>4. Future Occupant Amenity. In the words of planning consultant Sean Silk:</p> <p>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 a bedroom within the basement area. Not only does this layout fail to meet lifetime homes standards and</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>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.</p> <p>5. Non-compliance with building regulations. The Applicant's architectural drawings indicate a bathroom opening directly onto a staircase (2nd floor) and a complete disregard for fire regulations – no fire doors in the basement and ground floor, and no lobby with protected route to exit on the ground floor.</p> <p>6. In summary. Why is the Council (planning department) willing to give any consideration at all to a proposal that sacrifices so many positives – neighbour amenity, local employment and a valuable local service – in order to produce a substandard, cramped and non-compliant residential unit?</p> <p>I WISH TO BE NOTIFIED OF THE COMMITTEE DATE.</p>
