



Dear Mr Yeung,

ADDRESS: 206 KILBURN HIGH ROAD, LONDON NW6 4JH

APPLICATION REFERENCE: 2014/5496/P

I am sorry I did not have a chance to submit my comment before .

Following our objections to the previous undecided planning application (application reference: 2013/4815/P), below are our objections and observations for this current proposal.

1. Description of the proposal

The Council's website describes the application as the following: "Change of Use of 2nd floor Office Unit (Class B1) to Dwelling Flat (Class C3) (1 x 1 bedroom flat) & Change of Use of 3rd Storage Space(Class B8) to Dwelling Flat (Class C3) (1 x 1 bedroom flat) ".

The submitted plans also show the existing and proposed first floor plans, which formed part of the above mentioned undecided planning application, and they give the impression that they form part of this planning application and therefore there seems to be a discrepancy between the proposed drawings and the application scheme description and scope.

2. Awkward access to proposed flat

The access is at the rear of the property off Kingsgate Place. The path leading to the (communal) entrance door is always blocked by vehicles parked outside which restricts access. The access is used by at list four commercial occupiers and any restriction would be difficult .

Following the entrance door, the route is via a covered yard which leads to another entrance door leading to the communal hallway and staircase. The commercial unit has access to the hallway, staircase and first floor hallway where some of the rooms inside the back addition are retained for the commercial property.

Only after navigating a third set of doors, does one eventually reach the flat entrance door.

The combination of the commercial access along with the reconfigured staircase leading to the upper floors do not seem to sit comfortably with this shoehorned residential unit.

3. Design

The planning guide (Camden Planning Guidance, Housing) requests that the accommodation should have adequate size, shape, door arrangement, height, insulation for noise and vibration and natural lighting and ventilation.

Floor area

The proposed residential units, 2F and 3F, are of inadequate size and do not meet or exceed the required floor area of 48m² for a 2 persons unit.

The proposal does not indicate the size of the bedrooms therefore we cannot determine whether the minimum double bedroom size of 11m² has been achieved.

The lack of room sizes and layout proposals is suggestive of inadequate sizes and design, with inadequacies hidden by lack of details.

It is required that all accommodation has sufficient internal storage space to meet the likely needs and requirements of potential occupiers. The required internal storage space with its minimum storage area has not been indicated on the plans.

Layout

The shape and layout of the proposed unit 1F is very awkward and does not flow naturally. One would expect the reception room to face the lighter part of the building and the busy high street with the bedroom(s) being positioned towards the quieter section of the building.

With unusual layouts as this, it would be beneficial to show proposed layouts of beds, kitchen units, living room and dining room basic furniture to demonstrate that the unit 1F is actually usable.

The same observations are valid for units 2F and 3F; the bedrooms face the light and busy high street whereas the reception rooms face the quieter Northeast facing side of the building.

Layout/ building control

The proposal does not appear to comply with building regulations.

The landing outside the entrance of unit 2F is interrupted by the angled entrance door to the unit and has not the required uninterrupted length that matches the width of the staircase. In order to remedy this, the entrance door would need to be pushed further into the flat and therefore further reducing its already inadequate size.

Adequate landing is also lacking from the entrance area of unit 3F.

Ceiling height

We cannot see a reference to ceiling height on the proposed plans therefore we cannot assess whether the habitable rooms have a min required 2.3m as referred to in Camden Planning Guidance, Housing: Residential development standards.

Light

"Residential developments should maximise sunlight and daylight." "Overall the internal layout design should seek to ensure the main living room and other frequently used rooms are on the south side and rooms that benefit less from sunlight (bathrooms, utility rooms) on the north side. Kitchens are better positioned on the north side to avoid excessive heat gain." The proposal in unit 1F includes a southeast facing kitchen/ diningroom and a northeast facing reception room with west-southwest facing bedrooms and therefore the scheme does not maximise the sunlight/ daylight in the livingroom.

The guide states that "windows should be located away from busy roads and railway lines/tracks to minimise noise and pollution and vibration." The bedrooms face the busy and noisy high road where the noise, pollution and ventilation are a concern.

Noise

The Council's planning guidance on amenities states that a way to minimise the impact of noise on the development design is by "Locating noise sensitive areas/rooms away from the parts of the site most exposed to noises". The bedrooms are the most sensitive areas yet they face the busy high road and therefore do not meet this requirement.

Refuse & Cycle storage

Two additional aspects not included in the scheme include cycle storage and waste and recycling storage. The planning application form refers to the fact that existing arrangement would be used.

The Council's Camden Planning Guidance, Design: Waste recycling and storage aims to ensure that appropriate storage for waste and recyclables is provided in all developments in Camden however, we cannot see how this has been taken into account in the proposal.

Regards,

Mr J. Patel.

