

**From:** [Jonathan Bor](#)  
**To:** [TeampNI](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Mansfield Bowling Club Appeal (APP/X5210/W/16/3153454)  
**Date:** 26 August 2016 06:19:08

---

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Jonathan Bor <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Mansfield Bowling Club Appeal (APP/X5210/W/16/3153454)  
**Date:** 26 August 2016 at 06:17:48 BST  
**To:** [TeampNI@pins.ssi.gov.uk](mailto:TeampNI@pins.ssi.gov.uk)

I am forwarding my email incorrectly sent to Camden Council concerning the Mansfield Bowling Club Appeal.  
Yours sincerely,  
Jonathan Bor

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Jonathan Bor <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Mansfield Bowling Club NW5, application 2015/1444/P  
**Date:** 26 August 2016 at 06:11:02 BST  
**To:** [Jennifer.walsh@camden.gov.uk](mailto:Jennifer.walsh@camden.gov.uk)

Dear Ms Walsh,

I reside at Regency Lawn.  
No doubt they are entitled to do so, but the bowling club's proposed development plans are seemingly put forward in a campaign of attrition, generating more heat than light and regularly re-hashed when people are on holiday.

It is clear that nothing material has changed however about the basic elements of the planning application.

A key issue is the designation of the site for leisure use. It is an obstacle to development which a developer must deal with head on and on which it should make a proper and persuasive case.  
The club and its advisers have still failed to address in any systematic and rational manner why this site should cease to be designated for leisure use.

It remains the case, after years of applications, that the basic premise of the development has not been justified. On the contrary, no serious attempt has yet been made to evaluate properly the potential sporting and leisure uses of the site.

To my mind the potential for leisure and sporting use is likely in fact to be overwhelming (consider the demand for places at the Talacre centre ,as one example).

Most observers have known for years that is likely to be the case. Why is this not properly examined by the developers?

Indeed one suspects that the demand for leisure and sporting use at the site is only likely to increase, whereas the proposed development will for all practical purposes cause the site to be lost to meaningful leisure use for all time.

Any reader of the case for development will conclude that the applicant has not begun address properly the basic issue raised by the development- this site is designated for leisure use.

Why should that use now be lost ? Nothing in the application answers that question adequately.

If the Council, remains minded to approve the development, despite the restrictions on the site then, in addition to comments made previously:

the proposed development remains far too dense for the land and amenities;  
the management and control of the open spaces remain a matter of real concern; no adequate scheme is proposed;  
concerns of overlooking remain,

Yours sincerely,  
Jonathan Bor