

Paul Acland. Uint 8 . 73 Maygrove road. London NW6 2EG

Planning Department  
Camden Council  
5 Pancras square  
London N1C 4AG  
Attention: Fergus Freeney  
[Fergus.Freeney@Camden.gov.uk](mailto:Fergus.Freeney@Camden.gov.uk)

Dear Sir

I write in regards to the planning permission application for **73 Maygrove Road (2015/2301/P)**. I object to the planning permission and note as follows:

**1) I question if the proposed development constitutes over-development on the site.**

There are two buildings occupying the site at 73 Maygrove Road and when deciding whether planning should be given for the two side extensions for 73 Maygrove ( the front building facing onto the street) consideration needs to be given to the planning history and the current planning application for 73a Maygrove road ( the rear building that overlooks Maygrove Peace Park).

73a Maygrove Road ( the rear building) was until the start of the year zoned as B1(light Industrial). Under permitted developments, the Owner has been able to convert the work units into residential units, and has recently applied for planning permission ( 2015/239/P) to add an additional roof extension to the existing building. I have no objection in principle to this proposal(2015/239/P), but would request that frames of the new windows in the roof extension are anthracite grey to match the colour of the proposed zinc roof rather than white, as currently proposed. While white aluminium windows may be appropriate in a brick faced building, they are, in my opinion, not appropriate in the roof extensions. Dark Anthracite frames will blend in with the roof. White frames will stick out like a sore thumb.

Consideration needs to be given to the fact that current front building currently contains 15 flats and live work units and an office and the rear building will contain 17 new residential units, once the works are completed. The Side extensions would add another two units on the site and will substantially increase the size of the Office unit.

In total there will be 30 residential units on the site. And 34 units if planning permission is granted for the roof extension to the rear building and the side extensions to the front building.

**2) Provision for waste collection ./ disposal.**

The proposal is contrary to policy 5.40 which states that Developments will also need To provide 'Facilities for the storage, recycling and disposal of waste'.

Currently 73 Maygrove road has 3 nos large waste bins on wheels (footprint 1.2m x 900mm) and 4 nos large recycling bins on wheels ( footprint 800mm x 600mm) . 73a Maygrove Road has 2 nos large waste bins on wheels. See attached photos.

These waste bins are filled to over following and are collected weekly by Camden waste collection services ( the waste bins need to be on wheels as the waste trucks park on the street and wheels the bins out ) .

With the new residential units at number 73a Maygrove road ( allowed under permitted development ) the amount of rubbish generated will be significantly increased ( the offices that previously occupied the building were mostly paperless) There will need to be additional general waste bins and new recycling bins for the new residential units.

The new extension that the applicant is proposing building onto the east end of 73 Maygrove will built on a communal area that is currently reserved for waste bins and no real provision has been made for space for waste bins as part of the current planning application,. The current planning submission (2015/2301/P) shows space for only four bins recycling bins taking up an area of 2sqm when in fact at least twice this area is required.

The area proposed area for for the waste bins is shown at the end of the car park . If located here the bins would obstruct access to the car parks, making the two end car parks ( one of which does not belong to the applicant ) unusable.

This will become evident to the case officer when he makes a site visit.

Inevitable, if the planning permission was granted for the current proposed scheme, the waste bins would end up in the front of the building, as is the case at 75 Maygrove road and at 59 Maygrove road ( where the storage space for the bins was clearly an after-thought) – photos attached..

We do not want the front of the buildings on Maygrove Road littered with waste bins and /or crudely designed waste sheds. This might have been acceptable when this part of Maygrove road was primarily BI commercial, however now that Iversion Tyres, The Iversion road Garage, Handrail house, The garden centre and Liddell road estate are all being redeveloped as residential blocks it is no longer acceptable to have waste disposal bins on the street side of the building in what is now a residential area.

Adequate long term provision must be made for waste bins within the new developments, either in the basement, or behind the buildings and this storage area needs to be carefully designed and detailed at planning stage so a storage area is built and not converted into more valuable residential space. It is not enough to show an indicative waste disposal area in the plan.

The Current proposal for 73 Maygrove road does not have adequate on site area for the Collection of waste and we therefore request that the application is refused and the applicant be asked to submit new plans showing a waste disposal area that is adequate in size, easily accessible for the Camden refuse collection team and out for site from the street and from the residents living at 73 and 73a Maygrove road. In order to ensure that the Waste bins do not end up on the street or in front of the building.

All the other developments on Maygrove road Apart from 59 Maygrove road have waste Rooms built into the building.

### 3) **Cycle Storage.**

The proposal is contrary to clause 5.12 6.9 of the London Plan because it **does not** provide , integrated, convenient and accessible cycle parking facilities in line with the minimum standards for residential dwellings”

The proposal tries to comply with Camden’s policy regarding cycle storage by installing 11 bicycle racks at the front of the existing building. These cycle racks will not be used and will simply clutter up the front of the building.

The Majority of councils in London have been trying in recent years to reduce street clutter. We do not want unused cycle racks cluttering up the front of 73 Maygrove road in an area that would be better suited for planters.

There are already two bicycle racks installed by Camden on the pavement in front of 73 Maygrove road. These are rarely used, and if they are it is only by cyclists who leave their bikes here for an hour or two during the day. There is a definite need for cycle storage, but it needs to be a secure indoor cycle storage shed. Cycles cannot be left overnight on the pavement as they get stolen, and cyclists will not leave cycles outside as they get wet and quickly deteriorate.

All the other developments being built on Maygrove road and Iversion road have secure weatherproof cycle storage in the building not visible from the road. 69 Maygrove has a room for 120 cycles in the basement.

If in principle Camden considers that they extensions are acceptable then we would request that a new application be submitted that includes a large indoor cycle storage room that is integrated into the extension and is not in front of the existing building.

### 4) **Design**

The planning application draws attention to London Plan 2015 Policy 3.5 which states that *“the housing development should be of the highest quality internally, externally and in relation to their context and to the wider environment”*. And 5.10 which states that *“The design of all new housing development should enhance the quality of local places, taking into account physical context, local character, density, tenure and land use mix and relationship with and provision of public communal and open spaces”*.

We contend that the application is contrary to above policies as well as 5.17 policy 7.4 and 5.16 and 5.17 policy 7.4 and 7.6. It is contrary to Camden’s core strategy policy DP24 ‘Securing High Quality Design’ and to policy 5 of the west Hampstead and Fortune Green Neighbourhood Plan.

**The proposal is not of the highest quality of design and has no relationship to its immediate and wider context and it does not make a positive contribution to the public realm (the street and maygrove peace park).**

The original building at 73 Maygrove was built in the 1950s as a Button factory, an elegant well proportioned warehouse with strip industrial Crittall windows and external green tiles.

This type of building is rare in North west London, and is more commonly found in Clerkenwell and Bermondsey. In the 1990s the building was converted into a mixture of residential, live work and commercial office units. The facade was re-clad in new yellow bricks with black banding, a new storey added with a pitched slate clad roof. The industrial Crittall style windows were removed and replaced with white Aluminium windows. The resultant building has none of the proportions or elegance of the original factory building, and is considered by the majority of people in the neighbourhood to be the ugliest building on the street.

Here is an opportunity to build extensions to the existing building which might, if carefully designed, enhance and improve the existing building. The proposal does exactly the opposite, tacking on two ill conceived and poorly designed extensions onto the ends of the existing building.

The soft 'watercolour' rendered elevations submitted by the applicant should not deceive the officer into thinking that that application of a good enough standard.

This extension on the west side of the existing building marks the corner and entrance to the Peace Park, and occupies an important position on the street, and importantly all three elevations ( front, back and side) can be seen from the public domain .

It should be designed to so it relates both to the existing building and to the new building currently under construction on the other side of the park. The current proposal does none of this and does not "*Optimise the potential of site*" ( *London plan 5.17 Policy 7.6* ) .

The Western elevation overlooking the park is a monolithic three storeyed yellow brick flank wall facing onto Maygrove Peace Park with two square windows randomly positioned. This wall will create a cliff-like feeling when viewed from the park, creating an unwelcome sense of enclosure. Importantly this yellow brick wall does not return ( the front and back of the extension are clad in vertical slate tiles) so this wall will read like a thin shear wall, not relating to anything around it.

On the front elevation, the windows do not align through with the existing building and create long dark tunnels leading to the rear carpark.

If designed with care, this might be an interesting extension that could enhance the park and the street. The elevation overlooking the park could be more articulated and broken up with carefully positioned windows and recessed balconies, a more picturesque massing. It could be a well designed building which the London and Camden's Local Plan encourages. The current proposal is not.

**We therefore request that the applicant be refused on the ground that the proposal is not of the highest quality of design and has no relationship to its immediate and wider context and does not make a positive contribution to the public realm (the street and maygrove peace park).**

#### **4.1 Materials**

The Front and rear facades of the proposed extensions are clad in slate. There are no other examples of vertical cladding in this area of west Hampstead.

The slate tiles do not compliment or replicate the neighbouring buildings and look flimsy and cheap especially when used with the aluminium slot windows which again do not relate to the existing or surrounding buildings. Building a light weight building clad in vertical slates is a cheaper than building in brick and I question whether this is why the application is putting forward this proposal.

To the West of 73 Maygrove Road is the New development by Regal Homes, designed by Hopkins Architects, and to the East will be the new Development on Liddell Road designed by Maccreeanor Lavington Architects. Both are renowned architects who are known for designing good and carefully detailed brick buildings. Both new developments are clad in brick which has been carefully detailed. In both of these developments, the windows are set back from the facade to create deep reveals, the colour and the texture of the brick has been carefully considered and detailed so that there is a variation in brickwork to add interest to the facade.

The existing building (73 maygrove) is also built of brick and therefore we consider that the new extensions should also be in brick, carefully detailed with windows recessed back from the facade.

I therefore consider that the materials proposed are inappropriate and do not refer to, or compliment the existing building or the surrounding buildings. The proposal is therefore not in line with the London Plan, Camden's Local Planning guidelines and the The West Hampstead and Fortune Green Neighbourhood Plan, I therefore request that planning permission is not granted for the design in its current form.

#### **4.2 Landscaping**

The proposed plan does not include for any additional landscaping to the front of the existing building. There is space for additional landscaping in front of the building and some additional planters would significantly improve the look of the building. We note that the London Plan states that any new development should “ *provide high quality indoor and outdoor spaces and integrate well with the surrounding streets and open spaces*” and DP24 ‘*The provision of appropriate hard and soft landscaping*’.

#### **5. Amenity**

I contend that the development would have a negative affect on my amenities.

I live in the top roof flat at 73 Maygrove Road and own 2nos car spaces in the gated car park . If planning permission were granted I would:

- 1) look out onto the waste bins
- 2) I would not be able to park in one of my car spaces
- 3) I would lose my second car space ( the proposed scheme simply removes my second car space !)
- 4) I would lose the ‘communal ‘ space which is currently used for waste storage , as the Proposed builds on this communal area.

#### **5. In conclusion**

There is considerable development on Maygrove Road. In the next five years, the nature of this road will have been completely transformed as its northern side becomes lined , from west hampstead down, with 4 / 5 storeyed apartment blocks. As a resident, I accept that new

housing needs to be built and it may be in my back yard, it needs to be of the highest quality of design which I consider that the current proposal falls well short of.

We would request that Camden learns from the mistakes made at 59 Maygrove Road where planning permission was given for a poorly conceived and badly designed building. At 59 Maygrove what could have been a simple well proportion building is one of the most unattractive buildings on the street which does not enhance the streetscape.

The detailing and use of materials is important and a project that is in a dominant position, like 73 Maygrove road, consideration needs to be given to materials and detailing at planning. At 59 Maygrove road the windows are not set back enough from the facade and the building is covered with redundant metal balustrades which sit hard against the windows. The imitation timber panels at the side of the windows are completely random, and do not relate to anything in the surrounding area, they are out of context and look cheap. Cheap and flimsy plastic trims, which will probably soon start to fall off, had to be added around the windows after the building was complete and stainless steel covers installed on the outside to hide pipes and cabling.

At 59 Maygrove road little consideration was given to refuse storage at planning stage. An adequately sized waste bin / refuse room integrated into the building should have been shown on the planning drawings and it should have been conditioned that the waste bins / refuse room could not be constructed in front of the building. As this did not happen it was inevitable that the waste bins ended up on the street in prime position directly in front of the entrance in an area which should have been landscaped with a planter and trees.

I request that the planning officer visit 59 Maygrove road when considering the application for 73 Maygrove road and takes into consideration the letter written to the council with regards this project.

I do not want another badly designed and detailed building on Maygrove road and consider that if planning permission granted the two extension to 73 Maygrove will be an eyesore with the street elevation cluttered up with storage bins and unused cycle racks.

The owners of 73 Maygrove road have already gained planning permission (under permitted development) to convert the rear building from B1 to residential use and may be granted planning permission to add more units by adding a roof extension. If the council considers that the principle of development is acceptable (which we question), we request that plans are resubmitted with a well designed building with appropriate and robust materials carefully detailed, a scheme which is sympathetic to, references and enhances the existing building and the surrounding area, especially Maygrove Peace Park. We also request that any submitted scheme has a sensible and adequate integrated off street / out of site storage space for waste and indoor off street bicycle storage.

Your Sincerely

Paul Acland