

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7803/P	vasco leemans	61 Antrim Mansions Antrim Road NW3 4XL	04/02/2015 22:04:31	OBJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The former Nurse's Home building is a historical 1930 building located within the Belsize Park Conservation Zone. The proposed building works would materially change the character of this historical building which is very clearly not in the spirit conserving the building's historical character. The sole objective for this proposed extension is to generate multi-million profits from the sale of private apartments that this would generate. Should this application be approved by the Council it seems this would create an important precedent which would make a mockery of the concept of a Conservation Zone, and call into question the ethics of this process in the light of the considerable profits that stand to be generated from this project.</li><li>• The proposed building extension would increase the number of people living in this building substantially by adding a vast number of small flats that represent living conditions considerably worse than the average property in this residential area. In addition the present hostel has been creating problems in the local area, one of which is noise to the surrounding residents. Consequently increasing the amount of occupants in these dwellings will almost surely result in these problems being exacerbated and put even more stress on the community and local amenities.</li><li>• The old plane tree in the gardens of the surrounding Waltham Court is an essential and treasured element of green for the many residents of both Waltham Court and Antrim Mansions who overlook the garden. By building the proposed new extension the foliage and branches of the tree and especially its roots are guaranteed to get severely damaged/cut which means that the tree's lifespan will be drastically reduced. In addition there is the fact that once the extension has been built there will surely be a request to prune the tree for safety reasons. Both of the above will result in a measurable impact on the environment.</li></ul>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7803/P	AJW Gow and ML Michalski	2 Priory Mansions England's Lane England's Lane London NW3 4TH	05/02/2015 22:17:34	OBJEMPER	We object to the proposed plans, which, at a minimum, require further development to tackle losses of amenity that will arise. The plans as presented will produce a considerable loss of amenity in terms of Residents' Parking in the immediate vicinity. The proposed new Private Residential plans will also produce a loss of environmental (including possible historic and cultural) and aesthetic amenity around a Conservation Area. These points are developed below.

#### Parking – Transport Report

1. The proposed changes will result in a loss of amenity regarding parking. Parking in the immediate vicinity is already under great pressure. The addition of 9 new private apartments can only add to that pressure, as the plans make no provision for further parking. Indeed, the plans propose to REMOVE the existing off-street parking at England's Lane Residence for up to 16 cars, leaving only one (1) disabled bay. Thus, 15 or 16 parking spaces will be removed while creating the potential for new vehicles – 9, if one per new private residence is assumed (not an unreasonable assumption, as each of the private residents in the immediate neighbourhood we know, including us, has at least one vehicle, and some have two). The net effect, therefore, can be expected to be 24 or more residents' parking spaces needed, but space for these does not exist.

2. The absence of off-street parking in the proposal runs counter to Camden Planning Policy, we believe, which, on our understanding from past issues, requires off-street parking for any new private accommodation.

3. The plans openly admit that suitable research has not been conducted. This makes the plan flawed in respect of Transport, as well as running counter to planning policy. Section 2.12 of the Transport Report states: 'A survey of existing travel habits has not been conducted to support the planning application. However, the Site is currently used as a hostel where car ownership levels are anticipated to be very low with the majority of trips undertaken on foot or by bicycle outside of the peak hours.' This makes the plan flawed in four crucial ways: (i) Had this research been conducted, it would quickly have emerged that almost all the vehicles parked in the residents' bays immediately around England's Lane Residence belong to residents there, as well as any that are parked within the existing car parking available to the rear of the Residence, which the plans propose to remove. The implicit assumption that those housed in the hostel will not have vehicles is wrong. (ii) Simple observation also reveals that vehicles park also to visit residents, or the premises, including Camden local authority vehicles, which often also park inside the gates in the Residence's parking space (both cars and Transit-type vans). (iii) The assumption that most journeys will be made by means other than cars outside peak-hours has no basis. As a neighbour, the evidence is that some of the Residence's residents do make journeys by car at the start and end of the working day. (By contrast, there is no more than very limited, occasional and odd, evidence of bicycle use.) (iv) However, even if it were to be a correct assumption, given the levels of vehicle ownership/use at the Residence, the consequence of that correct assumption would be that the vehicles would need to remain parked in the Residents' Parking bays for the periods the owners were at work, or wherever else they might have travelled.

#### PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

We have examined the drawings and proposals for the private residential element. These do not make clear if the existing green space and tarmac will be retained as they are. Nor is there any indication

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>regarding the historic milestone from 1809, which sits in this portion. As the plans are not clear, precise and detailed comment is not possible. However, we wish to make three points that should be non-negotiable parts of any redevelopment.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The historic milestone must remain in place. To move it would be an act of vandalism and would represent a general loss of amenity to anyone concerned with history, tradition or culture.</li><li>2. The existing green space, with old trees, and tarmac between the green space and the north-eastern face of the building must be retained exactly as it is. Anything else would represent a loss of environmental and aesthetic amenity in a Conservation Area.</li><li>3. The proposed new gates on Haverstock Hill, situated directly in front of the proposed entrance to the new private residential development suggest that the green space will not be retained, however. The plans show a pathway cutting through the green space. This will break up the green space (which also appears to be reduced on the plans, but absent specific definition, no one can be sure of the situation here). Breaking-up the green space will cause loss of environmental and aesthetic amenity in a Conservation Area.</li><li>4. The drawings of the existing layout fail to show that there is presently a gate at the most northerly end of the property as it faces onto Haverstock Hill, adjacent to Walham Court (the neighbouring property on Haverstock Hill). In any redevelopment, the gate should be retained in this location, so as not to lose the amenity of the existing green space.</li></ol>

---