

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/1444/P	O D R Butt	40 York Rise Dartmouth Park London NW5 1SB	17/04/2015 14:40:55	OBJLETTE R	<p>I am a neighbour of the bowling club and look over the site. I should like to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed development.</p> <p>The bowling club is willfully refusing to see the principle issue: they have no right to build on open space and the part of the site which is not green field/ open space can only be re-developed for leisure purposes. Just saying there is no demand for leisure purposes (which I do not believe anyway) is not good enough. If they are unable to proceed on the basis that there is no demand for leisure facilities then they should put the land up for sale with the understanding that a buyer must comply with the strictures of Camden's planning policy.</p> <p>I would be happy to buy the site for £100 and make all the necessary undertakings and I am sure many people would pay a lot more! It seems to me that once it is established, as I do by my bid, that the site can be sold on an on-going basis for leisure they have no logical reason for asking Camden to allow them to develop. The planning law does not say the site must be used for leisure unless the owners can't sell it for enough money, it just says the site must be used for leisure full stop. The only reason the directors must want to develop is to make as much profit as possible (and bear in mind as far as I can see many of them never played bowls and got their shares for free).</p> <p>The club can also not argue that this is an enabling development. Just how expensive will it be to revamp the tennis club, especially as the club, presumably, will be willing to pay for many of the renovations, such as a new club house themselves? One or two flats at most I would guess; not by any stretch of the imagination the quantity of two and three storey buildings proposed.</p> <p>I think the planning application should fall at this very first hurdle; they have no valid reason for changing the existing parameters of the site. However, while I would not wish to give the impression that there should be any room for negotiation on the principle point, for the sake of thoroughness I would add the following additional points.</p> <p>Some of the housing/ flats would look directly into our back garden and the back of our house, spoiling its privacy.</p> <p>The proposed density of the site is far too great. I calculated, when originally shown the plan, that there could be something like 64 residents. At present the bowling club is tranquil. The to-ing and fro-ing of 64 people, not just in cars, but also by foot, bicycle; slamming doors, talking loudly at all times of the day, will considerably spoil the enjoyment of the garden (I am a keen gardener and also have an allotment). It will be as if we have another street and block of flats behind us. At present from early evening the bowling club is completely quiet and that would probably be the case with any future use for leisure.</p> <p>The entry to the site is narrow and is not suited to a major housing development.</p> <p>The development is likely to take at least two years and it would be hell to live through that period as large lorries and machinery enter and exit the site and a large amount of noise is generated. I have</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>worked opposite a couple of building sites in the City and it was not a pleasant experience.</p> <p>I do not believe the bowling club/ developer has produced enough information for their application; eg water table/ geological reports, details on materials to be used, explanation of how the site works would proceed and how long it would take, etc.etc.</p> <p>I could continue, but as I said above I do not think it necessary as the planning application should not even get to the stage of a detailed examination of the proposal.</p> <p>Open space is so precious; once gone, it is gone for good and we should hang on to what we have for dear life. To line the pockets of non-bowls playing club directors is no sufficient reason to throw the planning rules and principles out of the window.</p>

---

2015/1444/P	Linda Lefevre	35 Dartmouth Park Road Dartmouth Park NW5 1SU	21/04/2015 16:27:46	OBJNOT	<p>Mansfield Bowling Club site.</p> <p>I believe this site should be retained as open space for leisure and community use. It is designated as private open space and should remain so. It is a positive asset to the area.</p> <p>I have spent 40 years of my life as a primary school teacher in Inner London so I am keen to see young people having as many opportunities as possible to enjoy sports and physical activities. It is good for their health and wellbeing and encourages teamwork and personal challenge. I also know that most city schools have limited resources in terms of space and expertise. I have taught children who later excelled in tennis and fencing but who struggled to travel and find places to train and play sport. The Bowling Club site could be developed for both indoor and outdoor sports for the local community and the many local schools.</p> <p>I am also aware of the site's proud heritage as a gift from Angela Burdett Coutts in the 19th century for local residents to enjoy tennis and bowling. It is up to us to maintain this gift and not build on the site.</p>
-------------	---------------	---	---------------------	--------	--

---