

**From:** [Walsh, Jennifer](#)  
**To:** [TeampNI](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Objection to appeal re Mansfield Bowling Club NW5 –3153454  
**Date:** 26 August 2016 16:12:38

---

Further to the council's submission of the Hearing Statement. Please see below the additional comments received.

Regards

Jennifer

Jennifer Walsh  
Principal Planner

Telephone: 0207 974 3500



---

**From:** Keith Northrop [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 26 August 2016 16:07  
**To:** Walsh, Jennifer  
**Subject:** Objection to appeal re Mansfield Bowling Club NW5 – 2015/1444/ P

Dear Ms Walsh

Please find below my objection to the MBC planning appeal which I would be grateful if you could put before the Inspector.

Many thanks

Best regards

Keith

**Ref: Mansfield Bowling Club NW5 – 2015/1444/ P**

I object to the development.

The MBC site is designated for leisure not housing. This is in line not only with Camden's stated policies but also with the terms upon which the land was originally granted.

MBC (1920) Limited, the owners of the land are charged within their articles to promote sports activities on the site in accordance with the original wishes of the grant. As such it is their role to protect these activities on behalf of the community. Despite this they are in league with developers seeking to push through a dense housing development which, even as admitted by Generator, is not intended to enable leisure, but rather to make money. The estimated value of the developed property I understand to be well in excess of £20million with a surplus after costs of over £10million.

I note the Sportleisure Report prepared for the developers.

This states that indoor bowls is not viable on this site. This of course is within the context that other indoor bowls facilities survive. By contrast MBC has run itself into the ground with claims of waning interest despite bowlers on the outside green up until the day it closed.

At 6.13 (page 65) they refer to the use of the building as a sports hall/multi-use indoor space. They list possible activities and state in 6.13.4:

“Given the wide variety of leisure uses that can be accommodated in a facility of this type and the shortfall of sports hall facilities in Camden as identified in a recent Sport England Facilities Planning Model run, it can be assumed that demand exists for a facility of this type.”

However unlike other suggested activities they do not conduct a detailed analysis because, as 6.13.4 goes on:

“Supply and demand analysis of such use will not be undertaken as it is clear that this would not be a suitable use of the site from a fiscal viability/sustainability perspective”.

Quite apart from this contradicting the report they produced for the developers as part of the first planning application when their brief was to show a viable use for the building, the obvious point here is that they cannot possibly come to their conclusion without proper analysis.

I would like to record my deep concern that this is not picked up by KKP in their report for Camden, although of course by definition KKP agree with the statement that there is demand for a sports hall.

The reality is that from the work carried out by local residents and others it is apparent that there is a high level of serious interest from both well resourced specialist leisure providers as well as two local schools (La Sainte Union and Brookfield School), both of whom are crying out for more space for sport.

I understand Policy DP15 reads as follows:

*The Council will protect existing leisure facilities by resisting their loss unless: e) Adequate alternative facilities are already available in the area, and therefore no shortfall in provision will be created by the loss; or f) The leisure facility is no longer required and it can be demonstrated that there is no demand for an alternative leisure use of the site that would be suitable.*

Given the above and on the developer's own evidence it cannot possibly be the case that grounds for a change of use under (e) or (f) of DP15 have been made out and the case for the loss of leisure use of either the building or the ground upon which it stands has not been made.

1. As in the first planning application there has been a cynical absence of consultation. The various community interest groups in the area have simply not been involved. This is despite the clear words of the Planners (**Pre App Advice Letter 17/12/2013 Ref: 2013/6780/PRE**).

**Jonathan Markwell LBC to Ian Mayhead, Icen Projects):**

“ . . . it is considered that the engagement of the local community and seeking to gain a consensus (as far as possible) as to what the local community wish for this (northern) part of the site to be used for is required. To make any space successful in the long term, there is a need for community ‘buy-in’.

As such, you are strongly encouraged to undertake further detailed engagement with local groups /residents to ascertain proposed uses.

This is particularly the case owing to the ‘asset of community value’ designation at the site.”

A good example is Kenlyn Tennis Club in relation to Generator’s commissioned leisure report. From this it looks as though there has been considerable input from the club and therefore it supports the report. In truth however Kenlyn was hardly consulted and the proposals came as news to its committee. In particular, the suggestion it be given a 21 year lease ignores the club’s security of tenure. The membership Kenlyn has now voted to reject the present proposals and to support the position of residents that there should not be a change of use for the site away from leisure.

**2. What follows is without prejudice to the objection set out above.**

Even if some development was to be in any way considered:

- (i) This is not an enabling development.

Despite clear and repeated indications from the planners that limited enabling development in order to facilitate leisure use may be considered (see **Pre App Advice Letter 17/12/2013**), Generator have unashamedly produced a housing development scheme. There is nothing ‘enabling’ about it.

- (ii) This scheme is far too dense.

It seeks to cynically pack in as many properties as possible with the result that twenty one are crammed into the limited space. The result is that the Planners’ recommendations to the Planning Committee in 2013 for refusing MBC/Generator’s first planning application are even more applicable. In particular I note reasons 8-15. By definition these cannot have been addressed.

- (iii) Despite assurances to the contrary, the development does not keep to the present roof line. Because the apex of the present sloping roof is taken as the height of the proposed houses this means that the height of the side elevations would increase by at least six feet on what they are at present. This of course enables the developers to build an extra floor. It also means that the mass of the building is exceeded.

- (iv) The proposed increase in height on the side elevations leads to a severe loss of privacy to the surrounding houses as they would be badly overlooked. This also leads to loss of light issues.

- (v) The loss of privacy is exacerbated by the design of the houses themselves in that all external windows for each property face in a single direction.

- (vi) Car parking will be on the open space.

The point had previously been made to the developers that car parking must be within the foot print of the building. However this has been ignored with the result that a considerable amount of open space needs to be sacrificed in order to service the parking needs of twenty one properties.

- (vii) Increased pressure on existing roads and entrances. Again I note the Planners reasons for rejecting the previous application.

- (viii) Inappropriate design which is totally out of keeping with the surrounding area and is more about maximising profit than any other considerations, not least the fact that it is to sit in the middle of a conservation area.

- (ix) The building of flats is in breach of the covenants under which the land is held.

I therefore respectfully ask that the present appeal is rejected

Keith Northrop  
13 Dartmouth Park Avenue  
London NW5 1JL

Keith Northrop  
Consultant  
**GOODMAN DERRICK LLP**

DDI: +44 (0)20 7421 7948  
T: +44 (0)20 7404 0606

[www.gdlaw.co.uk](http://www.gdlaw.co.uk)

**Goodman Derrick LLP - 10 St Bride Street - London - EC4A 4AD - T: +44 (0)20 7404 0606 - F:  
+44 (0)20 7831 6407 - DX: 122 Chancery Lane**

**Please be aware of cyber-crime.** Where appropriate our client bank account details will be provided to you by the lawyer overseeing your work. We have no plans to change our bank account. Should you receive a notification that purports to advise a change in account details it is likely to be fraudulent. In that event please contact the lawyer overseeing your work who will advise the appropriate action.

Goodman Derrick LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales (registered number OC321066) and is regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority. A list of members names is open for inspection at our registered office as above. This e-mail and any attachments are confidential, may be protected by legal privilege and are intended only for the named addressee(s). If you are not the intended recipient you may not copy, disclose to anyone else or otherwise use the content of this e-mail or any attachment and should return them to the sender immediately and delete them from your system. Non-business related content is not authorised by the firm and we shall not be liable for it. Information about the firm and its services is available from [www.gdlaw.co.uk](http://www.gdlaw.co.uk)



This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer.

---

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

---