

From: [POSTAL APPEALS](#)
To: [TeamPNI](#)
Subject: FW: Mansfield Bowling Club NW5 – 2015/1444/ P: APP/X5210/W/16/3153454
Date: 26 August 2016 08:11:23

3rd Party for James

From: Oliver Dominic Ronald Butt [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 August 2016 20:12
To: POSTAL APPEALS
Subject: Ref: Mansfield Bowling Club NW5 – 2015/1444/ P: APP/X5210/W/16/3153454

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

APP/X5210/W/16/3153454

To the Planning Inspectorate,

I objected to the proposed housing development at Mansfield Bowling Club at the time it went to Camden's planning department and I should now like to object to the appeal made by the developers.

To make things easier I list below my principle objections:

1) The building incorporate windows and balconies that will over look our garden and the back of our house. In addition the developers by using the apex of the current building (which has a very long sloped roof) have considerably increased the proposed height of the new building while pretending they have not done so. Our house is downhill from the bowling club so the effect on us will be particularly severe if the development goes ahead. The new building will both overwhelm and overlook us.

2) At the moment the site is very peaceful. With the proposed development I estimate there will be about 65 people living there which will create endless noise and disturbance as people and cars come and go. It will also be continuous unlike with a sports club where there will inevitably be periods of no activity. The entrance to the site is narrow and I pity the people who will suffer the through traffic in Regency Lawn.

3) The current site is designated for leisure use and the open space is protected. Initially the bowling club, having evicted their own members who will not see a penny of any profit they expect to make from the development, tried to pretend there was no viable demand for leisure. This is simply not true. There is viable demand for leisure use. There are many potentially organisations that would like to make use of the site and there should be no problem raising the money to demolish the current building in exchange for new leisure facilities. Many neighbours, including myself, are willing to contribute towards the purchase of the site on the understanding the current planning restrictions stay in place. There should be no doubt that the sole rationale for the Bowling Club to get planning permission for the development is that residential land has a higher value than land for leisure use.

4) The current designs are uninspired and not sufficiently detailed. The developers have been willing to offer all sorts of alternatives and blandishments (including a sweetener in the form of a £600,000 bribe to Camden which I believe has now been

withdrawn) in exchange for conceding the principle that there should be a residential development. Should planning permission be granted, almost certainly what has been proposed will not be built. The land will be sold with planning permission at a high price to a new developer. Or they will come back with new proposals that will doubtless be even more profitable for them. These plans are a stalking horse to gain a principle. Councillor Mrs Gimson made some very good points on this matter at the Town Hall meeting.

I'll finish by saying that the bowling club has refused to seriously engage with the neighbours to discuss either the possibility of maintaining the club as a leisure site by way of letting us introducing them to the many contacts that have been made or the offer of the neighbours to buy the site. Open space and buildings for communal use are very precious and what makes London a special place to live in. Once these are lost to residential building they are lost for ever.

Best regards
Oliver Butt

40 York Rise, NW5 1SB

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