

Kathryn Moran
Regeneration and Planning
5 Pancras Square
London
N1C 4AG

14 Regent's Wharf
All Saints Street
London N1 9RL

020 7837 4477
london@nlpplanning.com

nlpplanning.com

Date 30 September 2015
Our ref DEPARTMENTAL/MH/OW/9854472v1
Your ref

Dear Ms Moran

Planning application ref: 2015/4396/P - 152 Royal College Street - Letter of Objection

On behalf of the freehold owner of Bruges Place, Baynes Street, Camden we write to register their objection to the proposed development at 152 Royal College Street (Ref: 2015/4396/P). The reasons for objecting are set out below.

These representations are made with full regard for the Development Plan for this site, which consists of The London Plan, Camden's Core Strategy (2010), Camden Development Policies (2010) and Camden Site Allocations (2013). The following has also been drafted with regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) as well Camden Planning Guidance (2014) and the Camden Broadway Conservation Area Appraisal.

Design and Conservation:

The site is located within the Camden Broadway Conservation Area, the merits of which are set out in detail within the objection made by the CAAC and will not be repeated here.

Based on our own review of the design proposals we consider that the proposed scheme would evidently not be in keeping with the immediate character of this area which, retains a number of strong defining characteristics that these proposals have little regard to.

The adjoining terrace properties, no. 154 and no. 156 are in our view 'positive contributors' to the Conservation Area and it is from these two properties that the proposed scheme should, we believe, take its cue. Indeed we note that it was with reference to these neighbouring properties that an Inspector dismissed an appeal at the same site earlier this year (APP/X5210/A/2229005) finding that proposals would "cause material harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area".

The current proposal would be a part storey taller than the neighbouring properties introducing an angled roof line from which there appears no design rationale when compared with the



neighbouring properties which, as noted by the inspector, "have a strong, unaltered parapet roofline". The proposed roof line has no regard to the form of the immediate buildings and as a result would detract from the Conservation Area.

Similarly, there is no reference point for the extended chimney structure, this is unnecessary visually damaging clutter.

The same could be said for the proposed depth of the property, which at ground floor and first floor would extend to the rear boundary significantly beyond the rear building line of no's. 154 and 156.

The proposal has no regard for the proportions of its neighbouring buildings, seeking to maximise development on the site rather than sit comfortably and appropriately within the immediate context. The additional bulk and mass to the rear would also have an unacceptable impact on the outlook of future residents of Bruges Place and lead to a sense of enclosure.

The design of the front elevation also has little regard to the character of the Conservation Area. In particular, the proposed shop front would detract from the neighbouring shop frontages which are identified as being good examples of surviving historic shopfronts in this conservation area by the Conservation Area Appraisal.

The building is on a corner plot which is highly visible in the Conservation Area, it is therefore important that the proposals enhance both the site but also the conservation area as a whole and are in keeping with the character of the area. This scheme does not. The proposals are, in respect to the above, contrary to Camden's Development Policies DP24 and DP25.

Daylight & Sunlight

The Daylight & Sunlight report fails to take full account of the future use of Bruges Place. The development of the first floor as residential use under permitted development rights is now almost complete. The Daylight & Sunlight report acknowledges that the use of Bruges Place will change (i.e. based on researching planning history) but uses the office layout for the basis of the analysis. The permitted development rights were prior approved under application ref: 2014/4321/P. As part of the application, plans were submitted showing the proposed layout of residential units and these are in the public domain. Therefore the consultants should be fully aware of the proposed layouts and should have tested the scheme on this basis. The daylight distribution results will, no doubt, be quite different and the modelling should be run again.

Failure to properly assess the daylight & sunlight impacts of the proposed development means it cannot be fully appraised against Development Policy DP26.

Work and living standards

It is not clear how the basement commercial space would receive adequate natural daylight and ventilation. If mechanical systems are proposed then details should be provided as to where plant machinery will be located. Plant could have amenity issues for neighbouring properties as well as for the proposed occupiers of the new unit in terms of visual impact and noise and should be considered now, rather than reserved for planning condition.

The bedroom at ground floor does not appear to have any natural light nor is it clear how it relates to the rest of the development. A bedroom positioned to the rear of a shop behind a goods lift and next to a wheelchair platform lift would not be afforded any level of amenity. It appears as though



**Nathaniel Lichfield
& Partners**

Planning, Design, Economics.

the bedroom would actually be used by the shop/office. It suggests that the retail unit is a live work unit. Indeed the Design and Access Statement suggests the proposals are for a three bedroom unit, whereas in total four bedrooms are shown.

The proposals would result in substandard living and work place accommodation and would therefore be contrary to Development Policies DP24 and DP28.

Amenity

The green roof area to the rear would need to be accessible for maintenance purposes. As a result, it could be accessed for recreational reasons also i.e. parties. As it is a private dwelling there is no means by which to control this. If it is used in this manner it would have significant amenity impacts in terms of noise, disturbance and overlooking for future occupiers of Bruges Place. This would be contrary to Development Policy DP26.

Construction and Servicing

The failure to provide a Construction Management Plan for the development, which includes a basement, means the true impact of the development on neighbouring properties cannot be fully considered.

Furthermore, the lack of detail in respect of servicing, given that a new access point from a side road is proposed, means that the operational elements of the commercial proposals cannot be fully considered against Development Policy DP20.

The Basement Impact Assessment does not consider the impacts of the development in line with Camden Planning Guidance 4 (as recently amended). For example, there is limited analysis of Ground Movement and no indication of the likely Burland Scale of movement. We would expect these details to be available prior to any decision being made. Without more detailed evidence the proposals cannot be considered against Development Policies DP27 or CPG 4.

Summary

The proposals being considered at 152 Royal College Street would have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring properties and residents as well as providing substandard accommodation for future residential and commercial occupiers.

Furthermore, by virtue of the design, bulk and scale the proposals would amount to inappropriate development in the Conservation Area which would cause harm to the heritage asset not outweighed by any clear public benefit. As such, when reviewed against Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework, planning permission should not be approved.

We trust the above is clear, however should you have any questions in respect to this objection please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Owain Nedin
Senior Planner

The Fitzroy Park Residents' Association

Please reply to: Dancers End
Fitzroy Park
Highgate
London
N6 6HT

Gidcon Whittingham
Senior Planning Officer
London Borough of Camden
5 Pancras Square
London
NIC 4AG

September 18, 2015

Dear Gideon

53 Fitzroy Park – application 2015/0441/P and related applications

Many thanks for organising the meeting last Friday to discuss our concerns with the latest version of the CTMP, rev 04, dated 10 July 2015. We agreed to document our concerns following the meeting.

1 Clarifications

Private Roads: it was clarified that the Council has duty of care towards all constituents when considering an Applicant's CTMP, whether or not the development site is accessed via a private road or the public highway, and has considerable powers to enforce, manage or restrict vehicle movements.

2012 Planning Consent: the Applicant seeks to use the CMP submitted with the 2011 application as an "approved" precedent for the current one: in fact it has yet to be discharged as one of a number of S106 clauses, including drainage and cumulative development impacts. It was confirmed at the JR hearing that Camden would consult FPRA in the course of discharging these obligations. The statement on p4 of the CTMP is incorrect.

FPRA position on development: during the meeting it was suggested that we are "anti development". In fact, as detailed in section 5 below, we have actively supported several significant developments, including complete demolitions and replacement builds, and we continue to support reasonable development in the road.

Emerging policy on basements: it was clarified that the current consultation on limiting basement development does represent emerging policy and can be taken into consideration in evaluating this application.

2 Safety of road users

In addition to the vehicle and cycle traffic noted in the CTMP, the road carries a considerable volume of pedestrian traffic, not only residents and visitors but recreational walkers (with and without dogs and children) for whom the road is a valued link between the Heath and Highgate Village. The road is the sole access route for some 100 or so Council allotment holders, and the members of the North London Bowling Club, and the main access for the residents of 70 properties, visitors and deliveries.

The relevant part of the road (about 160m from the Merton Lane junction) varies in width from 3.5m to 4.8m, and apart from a very short stretch has no refuge for pedestrians; segregation is impossible. It is essential that an HGV is halted to allow pedestrians to pass safely, and it should be noted that in the narrower parts even this will not be feasible. The swept path analyses make no allowance for safety zones around vehicles (the norm is 1m front and rear), so that even pedestrians will be prevented from passing while manoeuvres to and from the site take place.

These factors of course will impact the traffic flow, as noted below.

3 Traffic flow

Transit along the road at walking pace should take 2-3 minutes per movement, extending to at least 5 by stopping for pedestrians; the complex manoeuvres shown in the swept path diagrams could take a further 5 minutes. During all this time no other vehicle can pass – the road is effectively closed. Over a working day, this closure (based on the HGV traffic on p17 of the CTMP) could total 3 hours on a ‘maximum’ day, or about 1.5 hours on an ‘average’ day during phase 2 (35 weeks). This is clearly unacceptable over such a period, but the CTMP does not contain any allowance for pedestrian traffic.

There will clearly be at least two exceptionally disruptive movements – the arrival and removal of the 14 ton excavator described on p16 of the CTMP – whose impact is not quantified.

It was suggested by John Duffy at our meeting that in practice the swept path analyses exaggerated the complexity of the manoeuvres. Our professional advice is that this is not so – in fact, when allowing for a reasonable safety zone around each vehicle, the opposite is the case. For example, drawing VSP-KB-CAM-FITZROY PARK PHASE 3 shows substantial encroachment by the vehicle overhang, even without a safety margin, and drawing 1042.85 shows clash with kerbs, the pedestrian safety island and the property of Apex Lodge.

4 Reduction in HGV traffic from rev 03

In rev 04, HGV traffic is reduced by about 5%, primarily by assuming that a further 144m³ of spoil can be retained on site. This would clearly (as has been demonstrated in earlier work) have a significant impact on the local hydrology, including on the pond in the garden of no 55 which drains to the Bird Sanctuary pond on the Heath. This impact is not reflected in the BIA, and it must be.

5 Scale of the development

FPRA has actively supported substantial development along Fitzroy Park including, in the last 5 years, 51 Fitzroy Park, Fitzroy Farm and The Lodge where each site involved a full demolition and up to a 50% increase in size of the original dwelling including a single storey basement.

CMP delivery movements for these developments number:

51 Fitzroy Park – 6,000 sq ft: 218 HGV movements

Fitzroy Farm – 13,000 sq ft: 592 HGV movements

The Lodge – 7,000 sq ft: 474 HGV movements

Total of these three: 26,000 sq ft: 1,284 HGV movements

The current application for 53 Fitzroy Park, in contrast, is for a single dwelling of approx. 10,000 sq ft but requires 2,016 HGV movements.

The 30% increase in quantum over and above the 50% increase in quantum in the 2012 consent is a material consideration in these figures.

6 Parking

On p20 of the CTMP it is stated that no parking will be allowed on the site, and in correspondence with the Applicant's representative it has been stated that no site operative (contractor or subcontractor) will park on Fitzroy Park. FPRA operates a permit system for parking in the road; we depend on the owner, main contractor and subcontractors on the site to support its enforcement.

This restriction applies to HGVs, LGVs, private cars and skips.

We would welcome an assurance from the Applicant that such control can be exercised in practice, given the large number of trades which would be required during the fit-out phase.

Residents do enjoy parking rights on the road and we will not withdraw these in order to facilitate this project – indeed we do not have the powers to do so. Some parking of resident or visitor vehicles may be expected along the access route from time to time, and this has to be taken into account in managing traffic. We have canvassed the immediate neighbours on this question and we quote below from a typical response:

"...In addition, the Annexe to no. 55 has no off road parking so that when my parents are there with their car, there is nowhere else to park. At 90 years old, they have limited mobility and use a Blue Badge. Neither of them is in a position to walk up the road to park in Merton Lane...a complete ban on all parking for 2 years is not acceptable."

7 Protection of the road and repair of damage

The road is an old carriage drive and until the 1970/80s had no tarmac surface – the current surface is a thin coating over what is essentially a gravel path. Services, including sewers, are at a relatively shallow depth, and the road is clearly unable to carry a high volume of HGV traffic.

On p5 of the CTMP it is proposed to strengthen the road at the site, but no details of this work are included; it will require the consent of the frontage owners opposite, and any disruption to traffic flow will have to be agreed with FPRA and properly managed.

Subject to such agreement, the Applicant's engineer should certify to FPRA that all of the road used is capable of taking the proposed loading over the duration of the project.

On p22 are proposals for repairing any damage to the road, road furniture and services. An agreement, preferably secured by condition of any consent, will be required to ensure that any damage is promptly repaired, that a bond against repairs is deposited with our legal advisers, and that the contractor can demonstrate adequate insurance against damage to property.

8 Conclusion

Our key concerns are about safety and loss of amenity, including the significant disruption to users of the road throughout what could well extend to a three-year project. Loss of amenity, as reflected in Camden's emerging basement policy, aims to limit the time neighbours' lives are impacted by the variety of construction impacts such as noise (including high-pitched reverse alerts on HGVs), vibration, dust, dwell times when contractors double park to off-load, and damage to the road.

In these respects, we contend that the current CTMP represents a project that is excessive in scale and will have an unacceptable impact on its neighbours and on all the many users of Fitzroy Park, whether as residents, visitors, allotment holders, bowlers or members of the public who enjoy walking around Highgate and the Heath – all in order to build one house.

Yours sincerely

Karen Beare / Harley Atkinson

For Fitzroy Park Residents' Association