

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/1444/P	Keith Northrop	13 Dartmouth Park Avenue	06/05/2015 16:30:43	OBJ	<p>I object to the development.</p> <p>The MBC site is designated for leisure not housing. This is in line not only with Camden's stated policies but also with the terms upon which the land was originally granted.</p> <p>MBC (1920) Limited, the owners of the land are charged within their articles to promote sports activities on the site in accordance with the original wishes of the grant. As such it is their role to protect these activities on behalf of the community. Despite this they are in league with developers seeking to push through a dense housing development which, even as admitted by Generator, is not intended to enable leisure, but rather to make money. The estimated value of the developed property I understand to be well in excess of £20million with a surplus after costs of over £10million.</p> <p>I note the Sportleisure Report prepared for the developers.</p> <p>This states that indoor bowls is not viable on this site. This of course is within the context that other indoor bowls facilities survive. By contrast MBC has run itself into the ground with claims of waning interest despite bowlers on the outside green up until the day it closed.</p> <p>At 6.13 (page 65) they refer to the use of the building as a sports hall/multi-use indoor space. They list possible activities and state in 6.13.4:</p> <p>"Given the wide variety of leisure uses that can be accommodated in a facility of this type and the shortfall of sports hall facilities in Camden as identified in a recent Sport England Facilities Planning Model run, it can be assumed that demand exists for a facility of this type."</p> <p>However unlike other suggested activities they do not conduct a detailed analysis because, as 6.13.4 goes on:</p> <p>"Supply and demand analysis of such use will not be undertaken as it is clear that this would not be a suitable use of the site from a fiscal viability/sustainability perspective".</p> <p>This is based on the assertions in 6.13.3 that (i) this use would involve a substantial initial cost that generated revenues would not be sufficient to cover over its lifetime; and (ii) the only way to raise the initial funding would be via an enabling development on the Open Space and this would be unacceptable.</p> <p>Quite apart from this contradicting the report they produced for the developers as part of the first planning application when their brief was to show a viable use for the building, the obvious point here is that they cannot possibly come to their conclusion on sustainability without having conducted the supply and demand analysis. Their statement is therefore a nonsense. As to fundraising, it is not for them to dictate what may or not be possibilities.</p> <p>If, by their own admission a clear demand exists for the use of the building, this cannot be dismissed in a report such as this on the basis of subjective opinions on funding and sustainability.</p> <p>I would like to record my deep concern that this is not picked up by KKP in their report for Camden, although of course by definition KKP agree with the statement that there is demand for a sports hall. The reality is that from the work carried out by local residents and others it is apparent that there is a high level of serious interest from both well resourced specialist leisure providers as well as two local schools (La Sainte Union and Brookfield School), both of whom are crying out for more space for sport.</p> <p>I understand Policy DP15 reads as follows:</p> <p>The Council will protect existing leisure facilities by resisting their loss unless: e) Adequate alternative facilities are already available in the area, and therefore no shortfall in provision will be created by the loss; or f) The leisure facility is no longer required and it can be demonstrated that there is no demand</p>

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

for an alternative leisure use of the site that would be suitable.

Given the above and on the developer's own evidence it cannot possibly be the case that grounds for a change of use under (e) or (f) of DP15 have been made out and the case for the loss of leisure use of either the building or the ground upon which it stands has not been made.

1. As in the first planning application there has been a cynical absence of consultation. The various community interest groups in the area have simply not been involved. This is despite the clear words of the Planners (Pre App Advice Letter 17/12/2013 Ref: 2013/6780/PRE.

Jonathan Markwell LBC to Ian Mayhead, Icen Projects):

"... it is considered that the engagement of the local community and seeking to gain a consensus (as far as possible) as to what the local community wish for this (northern) part of the site to be used for is required. To make any space successful in the long term, there is a need for community 'buy-in'. As such, you are strongly encouraged to undertake further detailed engagement with local groups /residents to ascertain proposed uses.

This is particularly the case owing to the 'asset of community value' designation at the site."

A good example is Kenlyn Tennis Club in relation to Generator's commissioned leisure report. From this it looks as though there has been considerable input from the club and therefore it supports the report. In truth however Kenlyn was hardly consulted and the proposals have come as news to its committee. In particular, the suggestion it be given a 21 year lease ignores the club's security of tenure.

2. What follows is without prejudice to the objection set out above.

Even if some development was to be in any way considered:

(i) This is not an enabling development.

Despite clear and repeated indications from the planners that limited enabling development in order to facilitate leisure use may be considered (see Pre App Advice Letter 17/12/2013), Generator have unashamedly produced a housing development scheme. There is nothing 'enabling' about it.

(ii) This scheme is far too dense.

It seeks to cynically pack in as many properties as possible with the result that twenty one are crammed into the limited space. The result is that the Planners' recommendations to the Planning Committee in 2013 for refusing MBC/Generator's first planning application are even more applicable. In particular I note reasons 8-15. By definition these cannot have been addressed.

(iii) Despite assurances to the contrary, the development does not keep to the present roof line. Because the apex of the present sloping roof is taken as the height of the proposed houses this means that the height of the side elevations would increase by at least six feet on what they are at present. This of course enables the developers to build an extra floor. It also means that the mass of the building is exceeded.

(iv) The proposed increase in height on the side elevations leads to a severe loss of privacy to the surrounding houses as they would be badly overlooked. This also leads to loss of light issues.

(v) The loss of privacy is exacerbated by the design of the houses themselves in that all external windows for each property face in a single direction.

(vi) Car parking will be on the open space.

The point had previously been made to the developers that car parking must be within the foot print of the building. However this has been ignored with the result that a considerable amount of open space needs to be sacrificed in order to service the parking needs of twenty one properties.

(vii) Increased pressure on existing roads and entrances. Again I note the Planners reasons for

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/1444/P	H Francis	49 Croftdown Road NW5 1EL NW5 1EL	04/05/2015 11:00:38	OBJ	<p>rejecting the previous application.</p> <p>(viii) Inappropriate design which is totally out of keeping with the surrounding area and is more about maximising profit than any other considerations, not least the fact that it is to sit in the middle of a conservation area.</p> <p>(ix) The building of flats is in breach of the covenants under which the land is held.</p>
<hr/>					<p>I object to the proposals for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Camden is committed to preserving registered open space, unless there is absolutely no viable leisure or sporting use.</li>   <li>· The developer's consultation process was inadequate and failed to examine unsatisfied demand for sports that are particularly strong in the borough, e.g. gymnastics, fencing and children's indoor football training.</li>   <li>· Both the developer and Camden planning failed to consult the local schools about their own need for additional space for sports, or the demand from sports and leisure groups to rent their facilities (booked solid after school and at weekends).</li>   <li>· The borough is deficient in sports and leisure centre space, with limited space opportunity and no budget to create more. The need for a new sports hall has been identified. Policy is to support the existence and use of existing facilities owned by third parties. La Sainte Union, the girls' secondary school close to Mansfield Bowling Club has both the budget to renovate the building, the need for the additional sports amenity and willingness to manage the facility for community use out of school hours.</li>   <li>· The increase in local population from the proposed development will create pressure on local services, e.g. Brookfield School is oversubscribed and unable to take all applicants from families in Dartmouth Park.</li>   <li>· Ground water and flood risk. The River Fleet flows under York Rise, with numerous small tributaries beneath houses on neighbouring streets. The full-height basement floors of houses that would run the length of the building will interrupt the water table and push water into the lower floors of houses that are presently dry.</li> </ul>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/1444/P	Ann Connolly	53 Spence Rise LONDON NW3 1AR	02/05/2015 16:36:57	COMMEM AIL	<p>As I am nearly 70, I cannot go too far when I walk my dog. It really helps me to feel I'm not just walking along concrete streets if I see the sky and trees instead of buildings. The open space where Mansfield Bowling Club stands provides sight of a wide expanse of sky and I fear this would be lost if the proposed buildings were erected.</p> <p>I would also like to add that, since we moved into the area in 1989, neither my husband or I have ever been approached by the Bowling Club to become members. Yet I imagine that - as retirees - we would be just the sort of people the Club would want as members. It seems to me that the Club has just been left to run down.</p>

---