

From: [Ruth Appleton](#)
To: [TeampNI](#)
Subject: Mr James Bunten : Mansfield Bowling Site, NW5 1EP Case no: 3153454 Ref: APP/X5210/W/16/3153454
Date: 25 August 2016 10:32:05

. "I am against the appeal proposals for the following reasons:

1. there is a lot of demand for alternative leisure facilities within Dartmouth Park. The SLC report relied upon by the Appellant did not explore every suitable alternative use. For example, the local fencing club has expressed an interest and local schools are crying out for more sports facilities. The SLC report only considers uses which fall under the responsibility of Camden Sports, but there are plenty of other alternative leisure uses that may be interested in the site;
2. the people who wrote the reports that are relied upon by Generator did not properly engage with the local community or any local sports organisations to find out what types of leisure use would be in demand locally. When one local school tried to provide feedback, they were ignored. Therefore, in my view the reports are fundamentally flawed;
3. the Council overwhelmingly rejected this planning application (no Councillors voted in favour) and local residents are overwhelmingly against this application. So to decide this appeal against the clear wishes of local community would be wrong;
4. as a member of the local community, I know that the space provided on this site could be used for a wide range of leisure or community activities that would significantly support our area;
5. the stated core strategy of Camden Council is to support the retention and enhancement of existing community, leisure and cultural facilities. To allow this development would clearly be contrary to Camden's core strategy;
6. there is a lack of public parks (as opposed to metropolitan open spaces) in the Dartmouth Park area, so to grant this appeal would take away more space that could and should be used for public, community purposes;
7. The local borough is short of public indoor leisure facilities. This site should be used for indoor sports and leisure rather than being lost for good to residential development;
8. the development does not ensure access to open space is maintained because the proposed 'community garden' is fenced and gated. Over time, there is a clear danger that the public will be prevented from using the garden. There is precedent for this: the development in Goddard Place off Monnery Road in Islington, London was meant to preserve an area of open space for public use but within 18 months gates were installed to keep out non-residents and prevent them from using the space;

TS4/27331642/01/SKK/SKK 3 00 XXX 0000 00:00

9. as part of the local community, I am very concerned that the developers are using this application in order to change the planning use of the land (to allow residential development and remove the D2 designation) as a 'Trojan house' so that in the future they (or another developer) can carry out a bigger residential development;

10. as a local resident, it is clear that the local area does not need a big residential development but it does need more community and leisure facilities. To allow this appeal would be a mistake and would not serve the local community;

11. the land is designated as an asset of community value. However, it appears that this proposed development will allow a small number of people to make a large financial gain while removing this area of land from community use;

12. it is unclear to me why the £600,000 payment is needed to compensate for the loss of the site for leisure use if the developers are saying that no shortfall of leisure facilities would arise as a result of this development;

13. my house backs on to the site and the proposed development would be completely out of context for our area and would reduce the value of my property;

14. the site is in need of development, but the site does not need to be developed for residential property. This appeal should be rejected to make it clear that residential development will not be allowed and then other developers and operators focusing on Community & Leisure facilities will be more interested.

Ruth Appleton
12 Salcombe Lodge
1 Lissenden Gds NW5 1LZ.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>
