

Dike, Darlene

From: stephen crosher [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 February 2015 22:31
To: Planning
Subject: Planning application - 2014/7951/P, Imperial Works Perren Street NW5 3ED

FAO Jennifer Chivers

RE: Planning application **2014/7951/P, Imperial Works Perren Street NW5 3ED**

Dear Jennifer

We live at Number 21 Ryland Road, and were not notified of this planning application, despite being only 31 meters from the facade of Imperial works.

Visibility of proposed works

We feel that the visualisations the developers have put in the planning application have been taken from overly sympathetic angles. The additional floor would be clearly visible from the front of our house and at odds with the character of the existing building.

Commercial Property Requirement

The owners of Imperial works have applied for additional office space which seems to be a rather strange application for a number of reasons: The present available commercial space in Imperial Works is not fully occupied; Several very close properties have been converted from Commercial to Residential in the recent past, including Brinsmead (North end of Ryland Road at about 20m distance from Imperial Works), East Fleet House (Grafton Road, at about 100m from Imperial Works), Part of Ryland House (North end of Ryland Road adjacent to Brinsmead). There are also numerous other similar examples within a few minutes walk of Imperial Works.

It appears that there is insufficient demand for commercial properties in the area and to grant permission for additional commercial space in an area of little demand makes little sense.

We therefore object on the grounds that there is no requirement for this space in this part of Camden.

Overlooking

The proposed extension adds a floor to Imperial works. We can see from the Architects plans that a reasonable amount of effort has been made to minimise overlooking. However the proposals will still add to peoples ability to look directly into both our master bedroom at the front of our house and the bedroom in our loft conversion. i.e. the 2 principle bedrooms of the house will be further overlooked. In addition from the height of the extension on Imperial Works the occupiers will be able to view directly into our ground floor living room.

If this proposal were to be granted we would request that a condition be imposed that the windows to the East facade are made in obscured glass to prevent any overlooking.

Light

The addition of an additional floor will mean the loss of direct sunlight.

On the spring and autumn solstices (an indicative average for loss of light) the sun is at 20° at 4.00pm. 4.00pm is the time we currently lose direct sunlight from the ground floor on 21 March and September

(earlier in winter months and later in summer months). The addition of the proposed floor to Imperial works would result in the loss of direct sunlight to the ground floor approximately 30 minutes earlier at 3.30pm. this is roughly 180 hours less sunlight per year.

We have not undertaken the exact calculations but the order of magnitude is clear.

If this proposal were to be granted we would request that a loss of light compensation is paid by the developers to those affected via a Section 106 or similar special power. Perhaps £360 per dwelling per annum in perpetuity.

Noise/ construction interference

There have been a number of projects in Ryland Road over the last few years all of which have had impacts on the street and residents. this project proposes additional noise, dust and construction traffic.

This project will certainly add to the traffic and noise on a small street.

The road is already very busy for a small road - this is in part due to the fact that Ryland Road is used as a cut through for traffic turning West onto Prince of Wales Road. Much of this traffic is actually Camden Council vehicles from the depot on Holmes Road.

Most residents get vehicle damage from the steady flow of commercial vehicles on Ryland Road, we have had damage 4 times in 5 years. The vehicles tend to go too fast for the small road - which is residential with many young families. This is something that should be addressed within the council regardless of the outcome of this planning application.

If this proposal were to be granted we would request that Ryland Road is blocked at one end to prevent it being used as a cut through while there was an increase in construction traffic. This would hopefully have a close to zero net effect on the residents - i.e. the increase in construction traffic would be offset by the reduction in through traffic, making the situation no better but no worse for residents.

Domestic conversions

We suspect that the owners of Imperial Works plan at some point in the future to convert the building into residential use (we are aware that this has once been rejected by Camden) and that this proposed extension is actually planned to be the future pent-house apartment.

As Camden residents we support the creation of new dwellings within the borough as greater housing supply is the only way to meet London's housing needs and to lower the cost of housing for the next generation.

There has already been a major loss in commercial property in the Ryland Road area, which is detrimental to its historic Character. We would strongly support a stance by Camden to maintain the remaining commercial areas.

To avoid a future conversion to residential premises at Imperial Works is there a method of being pre-emptive? for example could a Section 106 condition be applied, where-by if an application for conversion to residential were applied for in the future a levy would be applied on lodging of the change of use application. This levy would be applied and paid whether the future residential application was successful or not. To make it meaningful the Section 106 may demand £500,000 or more to go to a community fund.

To conclude

Our 4 objections are

- Proposed scheme will be more visible than shown in application

- No requirement for commercial space
- Overlooking
- Noise, construction nuisance and traffic
- loss of light