

From: mandy rose [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 August 2016 18:01
To: TeampNI
Subject: FAO: Mr James Bunten ref. APP/X5210/W/16/3153454 Site. Mansfield Bowling Club
Croftdown Road NW5 1EP

6 Regency Lawn
Croftdown Road
London NW5 1HE
[REDACTED]

22nd August 2016

Mr James Bunten
The Planning Inspectorate
Room 3D
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol BS1 6PN

Dear Mr Bunten

ref. APP/X5210/W/16/3153454
Site address: Mansfield Bowling Club Croftdown Road Camden London NW5 1EP

We live at the above address and attach a plan which shows that our home backs onto MBC.

Our two emails of May and July 2015 recorded our reasons for objecting to the application which was refused. For ease of reference we are attaching copies herewith. Our reasons for objecting are unchanged.

We are against the appeal proposals for the following reasons.

At the meeting when planning permission was refused, seven councillors voted against, none voted in favour and three abstained, they deciding that the applicant had failed to demonstrate that the existing leisure facility is no longer required, that there is no demand for a suitable alternative leisure use of the site and that for that reason the loss of the facility would not undermine the range of services and facilities needed to support local communities, contrary to various Camden policies.

Presumably the onus is on the applicant to show that there was no such failure on its part.

If the permission sought is granted on appeal, there is a real prospect of the applicant, or another one, applying for a fresh permission for residential development but involving building more housing units.

We believe that although a forum was held at a local school in 2015, the applicant did not investigate with vigour how the site might be used, other than for the most part residential housing. Regency Lawn residents were not approached/consulted.

If permission is granted for residential development, the developed land will be lost and that loss cannot be mitigated through payment by the applicant of a contribution towards "local" sports facilities. Such a payment, to fund something somewhere else in Camden, would have no beneficial effect on my residential area. I do not understand why such a payment was either offered to or demanded by Camden. It was to be dealt with through a section 106 agreement.

Regarding Kenlyn Tennis Club, I would expect that unless it has some security of tenure, for example a formal lease for a term of years, there will be little prospect of the applicant being able in practice to create enhanced tennis facilities which have a realistic prospect of enduring.

If you would like to view the existing MBC building from the our home, with others if that is appropriate, do please contact me.

Yours sincerely.

Mr & Mrs A Rose

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