

**From:** John Southall  
**Sent:** 20 September 2015 22:33  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Re: Comments on 2015/4553/P have been received by the council.

L  
X

Sent from my iPhone

> On 20 Sep 2015, at 21:42, "[planning@camden.gov.uk](mailto:planning@camden.gov.uk)" <[planning@camden.gov.uk](mailto:planning@camden.gov.uk)> wrote:  
>  
> It is admirable that Origin are going to refurbish Ashton House. But the design and proposed development at Camden mews with 5 new houses is to the detriment of and does not enhance the conservation area.  
> We would ask the planning officers to request that Origin re consider their proposals in order to address the concerns below: WE object as follows:  
> 1 The proposal is overdevelopment for the site.  
> 2 Basement floor is served at the front by sloping rooflight to very narrow existing pavement. No other properties have this within area.  
> This could be potentially dangerous plus vehicles regularly use the pavement. Basement is obviously for 'habitable' use and does not comply with daylight and sunlight requirements and again is alien to the area and for mews homes  
> 3 4 houses would be sufficient with more glazing. External space could be taken from Ashton Court  
> 4 Poor quality and lack of amenity space for each house. Rear terrace is overshadowed by adjoining new properties' terraces. Maximum of 13square metres with a 2 square metre roof terrace and 11 sqm rear terrace. Daylight and sunlight should be investigated to these terraces. See section A-A.  
> 5 By using the reference to the existing buildings in the heritage impact assessment in which they admit are not significant within the conservation area implies that following that style is not acceptable as any new development should enhance the conservation area which is positive contribution. Better design quality is required not adopting an approach based on something that is insignificant to begin with.  
> The corner elevation to Camden Park Road should acknowledge corner condition and not be a mere extruded form of terrace.  
> 6 Full construction traffic management plan agreed before any demolition or construction commences so that residents of Camden Mews are safeguarded and the issue of refuse collections etc. are not compromised especially for any excavated material.  
> 7 Agreement of contribution for relaying cobbles to mews after construction and construction traffic ended.  
> 8 Drop off and pick up for residents of Ashton Court and access for wheelchair users / ambulances is required.  
> 9 Very careful management of the existing residents of Ashton Court should be initiated as majority are in their 70's and fragile. Are the residents in agreement with reduction in number of units?  
> There should be no loss of unit numbers of affordable sheltered homes.  
>  
>  
> Comments made by john southall of 84 Camden Mews, London, NW1 9BX

> Phone [REDACTED] Preferred

> Method of Contact is Email

>

> Comment Type is Comment Made and Notify of Committee Date

>

>

> This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud  
> service \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service  
\_\_\_\_\_

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Karl Kosmo [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 18 September 2015 12:48  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Application ref. 2015/4553/P

I live at Ashton Court, 254-256 Camden Rd, NW 1, for which this application has been submitted by my landlord Origin Housing. In response to the invitation to express my views on the proposals detailed in the application, I beg to submit as follows.

I have been living at this address since 1998. In those days this place was called a Retirement Housing unit. Sometime later it was redesignated as a Sheltered Housing Scheme. In your letter, the proposed work is described as "Reconfiguration, part demolition and extension of care home (Class C2)..." This is the first time I have come across Ashton Court being described as a "care home". It is not clear to me if the implication is that the proposal is meant to convert it into a care home - in which case, I assume, my contract as a tenant at this property would be terminated, and I wonder where I would end up.

It was in the year 2000 that a leaflet from our landlord informed us of the proposed renovation of kitchens and bathrooms. Subsequently we were told that, considering the sheer number of properties, the work could not be done everywhere at once; we would, understandably, have to wait for our turn. Some years ago I was one of the tenants invited at the presentation by the prospective contractors who answered our questions on the matter.

Time passed and tenants at Ashton Court heard nothing on this subject except that, as vacancies occurred, the voids were kept unoccupied - at present, out of 36 flats, 13 are vacant - and we were told that this was for our own convenience, so that while work was taking place we would be moved around within Ashton Court. We also heard of the renovation being done at other Schemes and expected it would be soon our turn.

What happened next hit us like a bolt from the blue. Last April a meeting was held here, called by the Care and Support division of Origin Housing. For the first time we were told of the proposed 'Reconfiguration' for which application for planning permission was going to be made. We were told that this house was no longer "fit for purpose". With a few exceptions the units here are studio flats and Origin Housing was of the opinion that "people want accommodation with separate bedrooms." It would be a substantial improvement in our existence. This was the first time we had been told that it was not just a matter of renovating our kitchens and bathrooms.

The meeting was well attended - 13 of us, if my memory serves me right, were present there (2 were abroad, 3 do not manage communication in English beyond a few words, 1 is the deputy scheme manager, 2 were permanently bedridden). Our protestations that we were satisfied with our present living conditions were ignored; repeated appeals to allow us to express by show of hands whether we wanted the proposed work to be carried out were turned down.

My submission is, of course, a personal one. However, I wish to add that it reflects a very broad consensus among my fellow tenants, many of whom find it virtually impossible to put it across in writing.

I submit that the thing that should worry you as overseers of the welfare of the citizens of the Borough of Camden is that the proposed work will reduce the number of units meant for old

people who lead a solitary existence from 36 to 24. How on earth can this be called an "extension"? With a crying shortage of affordable accommodation, this is a severe blow to the needs of an extremely vulnerable group.

Secondly, the proposed work will take years to complete. We have been told we could be moved around within the premises or could be moved somewhere else, with the right either to stay there or return to the reconfigured Ashton Court. In the first instance there will be years of life in a building site, with all the noise and dust in an area where movements in and out could be hazardous ventures for frail people. The alternative is to be torn away from the environment of one's existence and be replanted into a strange soil where one would have to learn to know new neighbours, find one's way to new shops, post offices, banks, GPs, hospitals; to learn new transport routes. Please try to imagine how someone 80 or over would cope with this.

Ashton Court is as right at the crossing of Camden Rd and Camden Park Rd, with a narrow mews at the back. The latter is a one-way street, with a stop just behind the house for two bus routes. With all the building material it might be partially or completely closed for a considerable time. Alternatively the stuff will be placed in our garden, making it impossible for us to be there.

Karl Kosmo  
28 Ashton Ct  
254-256 Camden Rd  
London NW1 9HF

Tel. 