

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/3132/P	Mr Jason Watkins	212a Camden Road London NW1 9HG	31/07/2016 21:06:41	OBJ	<p>Opening Comments</p> <p>I wish to make objections to the proposed development on 139 - 147 Camden Road. Application Number 2016/3132/P</p> <p>This is a wholly nonsensical and unrealistic planning application.</p> <p>Having planning rejected quite rightly on their previous applications, this developer is now once again trying to make profit on this sight.</p> <p>It is entirely the wrong place for a project of this kind, wholly out of keeping with its immediate environment and at odds with all other building use in the area. It is preposterous that such large building be built on this small plot.</p> <p>Destroying at one stroke, Camden Council's hugely successful community hub, that is Cantelowes Park. It flies in the face of all the councils efforts to create what has become a very successful community park for young people, children, skateboarders, elderly dog walkers and pupils from nearby schools and many more.</p> <p>A huge series of documentation has been produced by the developer, to try and ameliorate the severe and several adverse effects to the immediate location and it's surroundings, that this block would bring.</p> <p>The liaising the architect has done with Cantelowes Gardens, is quoted many times in the documentation. However it is crystal clear that whole feel and outlook of the Park would be obliterated. A park created it has to be said, with Public Money.</p> <p>An office block is out of keeping with the Residential nature of this area. It is predominately Residential, save for the Camden School For Girls, the Esso Garage and small Tesco's which serve that same Residential Community.</p> <p>It would have a significant and hugely detrimental effect on the Families in the Residential Property Opposite, of which we are one.</p> <p>My objections are manifold</p> <p>I own the Property at 212a. I am a Private Leaseholder to the Freeholder, Camden Council.</p> <p>The effect this property would inflict on our young Family will be traumatic and suffocating. This office block opposite would severely reduce the value of my property.</p> <p>Our quality of life would be substantially affected, through no fault our own.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

Our flat is on the Ground Floor and Lower Ground Floors of the property at 212.

And is arguably the most affected by the proposal.

-There will be immeasurable destruction of our quality of life; having to look directly out at such a dominating building.

- The building will obliterate the view and sense of light from of the front of our property.

The design aspects in the proposed block, that will give that building a sense of more light and openness internally will - because of its position in relation to our property, rob our flat of those same qualities.

And despite what the contradictory Daylight and Sunlight Report concludes, there will be a huge detrimental effect on the amount of light in to our raised ground level window. And have a severe effect on the lower ground floor of our property. It doesn't need a developers report to establish this.

I would like to deal with this point first:

Daylight and Sunlight Report

As a layman and with only a limited amount of time in which to respond to this application, even I can see the that the Daylight and Sunlight Report is both bias to the developer, contradictory and inaccurate. I would point the Planning Department to the Conclusion of the report, which is contradictory.

The conclusion of the report states there will be no effect on our property and that of our neighbours 210. No effect on the Lower Floors of the properties opposite - i.e my property at 2121A. It says they would be unaffected.

However in the main body of the report itself, it states that one of these tests failed.

To quote the report;

“Both of these (tests) must be met because the failure of either one would indicate an adverse effect on the daylighting to the other property”

Not only this but the report also concludes that it was unable to conduct the tests accurately.

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

“VSC tests carried out on all the windows along row of houses (208-226 Camden Road). The Daylight distribution within the rooms could not all be calculated due to the lack of information, without internal dimensions and layout information for some properties, therefore unable to calculated the NSC.”

I would ask that you look at section 7.3 in the Conclusion Sections and note that he tests proved that there was

“.....impact on the lower ground windows exceeding the 25 Degree Rule”

and

“...Houses 208/210/212 (LGD) exceeded 25Deg rule so calculations for no sky line were carried out, the results indicated some windows below min standard as stated in BRE Guide 0.8 times its former value”

If the above is correct the how can the bellow conclusion be in any way accurate.

‘ Our conclusion the proposed development has little or no impact on the daylight if the surrounding residential properties especially 210 and 212 (LGD)’

I note also form this comment, the use of the word ‘little’. Even though the impact in the report’s opinion is ‘little’, it is non the less, even in their terms, impact.

The truth is, that the impact is clearly very large and substantial. But even they admit there is impact.

I would like to ask, why my flat, which includes the Lower Ground Floor of 212a has been singled out with that of neighbour? These two flats contain the two windows most affected by the decreasing in natural light that the development would bring.

I am also not satisfied that the below statement contained in the Daylight and Sunlight Report is in any satisfactory:

“The information researched from the Planning Portal on room layouts of surrounding properties, floor plans scaled from archived drawings, the accuracy of dimensions is approximate due to thickness of lines scan quality.”

The word ‘approximate’ is simply not good enough to make conclusions and recommendations pertaining to the decreasing of natural lighting to my property.

The conclusions in in Section 7.4 in relation to ‘Obstruction of Sunlight are also not repressive of the facts and I would like to include photographs to illustrate this.

It appears that this report has been so quick to appease the needs of Cantelowes Gardens, it has

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

neglected to fully address the needs of our property opposite. The Hourly Overshadowing Analysis runs to 5pm. This is the time when the shadow ceases to cast its shadow on the Gardens.

What this analysis fails to address, is that that shadow of the proposed block, would continue on its journey around the clock (as it were).

It would continue round, with its shadow then depriving completely (because of how low the sun is in the evening) our building of direct evening sunlight. Which in the summer months continues for a considerable period until sundown.

I would like to send some photograph images to illustrate this.

The new building would block all evening sunlight in to our front living spaces and deprive us of not only visible sunsets but all the additional light that brings, each evening.

This element had been completely ignored in the Sunlight and Daylight Report and therefore makes any conclusions and opinions based within this report, void.

I will be exploring my 'Right to Light' options with RICS.

There are some points I would like to raise form the The Design and Access Statement

As stated in the report, the proposed height of the block may well match the height of our property, but crucially there are no similar height of buildings on that side of the road. The proposed development will appear singular and awkward in this context.

With no prospect of building on either side of it to lessen its isolation, as the Park is on one side and the railway line on the other which cannot support a high building: This makes further building impossible in these areas in the future.

Again, this is not the location for this building adding to the impression of it being an eyesore, out of keeping with its environs.

When looking at the plans for Landscaping, it is clear that the developers are keen to make alterations and improvements to Canteloves Gardens, which are all very environmentally friendly.

This however does not detract from the fact that the Office Block would physically dominate the park. The Park, where it borders on the Camden Road, is open and pleasing to the eye. With addition of the

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

**Comment:**   **Response:**

Block, the whole accept will be substantially altered. Form every area of the park this large office block will be visible. And once again negate the sense of space - which is the very function of open spaces in urban areas. An rare, open area used more often by less advantaged members of our community.

As per there own report, this block would deprive the Whitebeams of sunlight for a considerable amount of time in the afternoons. The environmental solutions that the architects have proposed, are present in the report as an attempt to lessen its adverse impact this development would have. These do not outweigh the simple fact that a large and unwanted shape, is being proposed directly on the perimeter of an open space, which will dominate a very successful public space. I cannot imagine this being proposed in Regents Park, Camden Square, Montpelier Gardens, or Rochester Square.

I would ask the Planning Department to agree with me, that this building would not in any way enhance the area.

Crucially there is no mention in the Design and Access Document of the environmental effect the block will have on us, living opposite an office block. staring at it every day and having it block our light. It would generate a wholly aggressive aspect in what is now a gentle urban view.

I would ask that the council review the Daylight and Sunlight report. I utterly reject the concluding statement in the Design and access Statement;

‘A shading impact assessment is carried out as part of the Daylight and Sunlight Report, which proves that the impact the development will have on the park is minimal’.

I believe this is not the case with the gardens. It certainly is not the case with i regard to our property.

The Daylight and Sunlight Report is complex and contradictory.

Nowhere does it allude to the unarguable fact, that the building will completely block the sunsets that we see most evenings and prevent summer evening sunlight enter our property. This will have an enormous affection the quality of our lives. I will include photographs taken earlier in the evening to illustrate this.

The whole tone of the report is slewed to the benefits of the building and the necessary adjustments it needs to make to satisfy the needs of the Gardens. The needs of us the residents, who are most effected, has not been mentioned. Which I find intolerable and dismissive.

Appearance Section of the report

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

This section delivers in overblown language and terminology the benefits of the buildings design. I notice in this section of the Design Statement, that the features would reflect the diverse nature of architecture on Camden Road. It quotes the Sainsburys building in this context. This supermarket is over a kilometre away from the Proposed Office Block and however unique its architectural qualities, it is considered by many, especially by locals, to be one of London's ugliest and oppressive buildings; Especially it's facade.

What I find most disappointing is that there is no mention included in the Design and Access Document, of the effect the buildings opposite - of which our flat in one. These properties are mainly made up of social housing. Our immediate neighbours are made of predominately of young families. The Documentation appears to be receptive to other parts of the surroundings except the houses opposite. Only in the Sunlight and Daylight report are we acknowledged. I I question the validity of this report.

Clearly an Independent Report needs to be initiated to give a truer picture of the way the building would produce the substantial loss of light to our properties.

The Block would also produce greater sound pollution to my property. The noise generated from the very busy Camden Road, would no longer be dissipated across the open ground of the railway and park. The building would act as a sounding board and bounce the sound back from the road on to our property, in a tunnel effect.

Overlooked

Our flat is directly opposite the proposed block. We would be entirely overlooked. Any individual on each floor would be able to view straight in to our main living area on our raised ground floor. And on our Lower Ground floor, there would be a view from the block, directly in to our young daughters bedroom. Again the development is a wholly inappropriate business property in a predominantly residential area.

Personal Context

Since our family suffered the terrible loss of our two and a half year old daughter 5 years ago, through a sudden illness, privacy has been a key aspect of the lives for me wife and my children. The decreased privacy, which this development would produce would is something that we would find wholly intolerable.

Safety

The reduction in parking spaces at the garage will have an effect on safety. I would like to make observations on the reduced number of car parking bays in the garage, contained

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Consultees Addr:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

in the reapplication. The car park of the Garage is in constant use. Looking out now on a Sunday, there 5 cars parked. this is a non bushiness day. The garage is extremely busy in the week and the carpark is always full, with approximately no less than 10 cars double parked in the car park area. These cars are moved constantly throughout the day as they are brought in to the garage and worked on the 2 ramps they have internally.

Most disturbingly, when the car park is full, cars occasionally park on Sandal Road. Blocking the pavement which in constant use, endangering pedestrians who have to walk around the parked cars and in to the road. Camden School of girls is opposite and pupils have to do the same. Having less parking spaces for the garage seems wholly unworkable and not consistent with the working evidence of the Garage.

In the Design Document the architect alludes to the garage having a system it would use in the future for its parked cars. Whatever the system is now, it appears not to be working. It has 9 parking bays. The new proposal has less than half that number. How can the garage cope with only 4 spaces when it can cope with 9 at present. The reason that there would be less parking available to the garage, is that the block is being built on its busy car park which garage relies on. Yet another reason why the whole project is unworkable.

It is very well documented that the junction of Sandal Road and Camden is dangerous.

The junction of Sandal Road and Camden Road has with 30 meters of it:

A busy School,

Two Bus Stops

A Petrol Station, with its entrance and exit either side the emerging Sandal Road.

Busy pedestrian crossing.

Many cyclists use the northbound side the Camden Road, crossing the junction. There is no bus lane and is therefore more dangerous to bicycles.

Any more volume in traffic during the construction phase will increase the danger to drivers, cyclists and passengers and pupils alike.

Even with new construction methods of pre-made sections being made in factories; the deliveries to the sight of these sections must be made. With large long lorries making the deliveries. Which can only increase the danger of this junction.

In the reapplication, the present design would close up the entrance on to the Camden Road. This would mean that all the cars worked on or assessed at the garage, would go in and emerge out of, one 'blind' single entrance and exit.

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

Therefore severely intensifying the volume in and out of the garage on Sandal Road, with its school. The entrance/exit is across the narrow pavement on to the road. And chiefly meaning more traffic turning in to and emerging from, Sandal Road. increasing the cache of road traffic accidents on the Camden Road.

I would also argue that although the staff at the garage might be aware of the inherent dangers of the junction and use the exit with care, their customers, who will be bringing their cars to the garage and picking them up, may well not.

This junction is at the heart of what is known as Camden's Death Mile. With its disproportionately high number of road traffic accidents. I have witnessed half a dozen and indeed 'helped out' with cyclist and a motorbike accident at the entrance to the garage in the last 2 years. I even witnessed a Police outrider to Barak Obamas convoy, come off his bike at this same junction on his way from London up to Stanstead Airport after a London Summit recently. (So it happens to the best of us). He was unharmed and Obama inquired after his wellbeing on his return to the US. Other users of this stretch of road have been less fortunate.

#### Summary

I have covered as many objections to the project as I am able to in the time you have given me. Including contesting the documentation results, outlining real safety concerns and the effects in the local area and its residents.

However it is the impact on my family that I am most concerned about. Which I have outlined above. I will be contacting the Council as the freeholder, to outline my concerns.

I shall also be contacting my solicitor.

Please inform me of how i can supply you with photographic evidence to support my objections.

I trust that common sense will once again prevail and this project be rejected.