

**SANDRA JULIEN**  
1c Highgate Rd London NW5 1JY

email [REDACTED]

The Chief Planning Officer  
Regeneration & Planning Development Management  
London Borough of Camden  
Town Hall, Judd Street  
London WC1H 9JE

26 October 2016

**Objections/Comments re: APPLICATION 2016/5336P**  
***Change of Use from Warehouse (Class B8) to 13 self-contained residential units***  
*Associated Ref. 2016/2279/P*

Firstly, I assume that the additional 2 units surfacing in this application are an attempt by the proprietor to frustrate objectors who have been critical of the previous associated application. We have been treated with disrespect from the outset and most of our valid requests and observations are ignored. Why are these plans and proposals not being examined by an independent authority at this stage?

**BIKE STORAGE**

Following questions about the previous bikes site causing a hazard near the main exit/entrance the new site still raises fire and safety issues. The bikes have to be brought in through an awkward front door opening right up against the internal wall of unit 10 (re-positioned): the entrance area has been shrunk. Bike owners also have to navigate from their parking space through an internal door, past the doors opening onto the newly allocated refuse area, then finally through to the main exit door.

**STATUTORY FIRE REGULATIONS**

Surely, each new planning amendment needs re-examination by Fire Assessment and Prevention Authorities? The Council only granted Prior Approval for 11 units on Associated application No. 2016/2779/P (subject to Section 106 Legal Agreement). Despite our requests we have not seen a Fire Officer's Report on the Fire Safety Regulations and requirements affecting the proposed development's residents and immediate neighbours.

The units proposed now total 13. I am concerned that the proprietor is squashing an extra two units into the building footprint at the cost of not providing adequate space for the main fire escape route. Neither has a secondary fire exit been allocated in view of the 26 plus residents. The main entrance/exit has been minimised, I don't believe it would be approved by the Fire Officer and the refuse internal access doors will cause issues in the narrow space.

**DENSITY**

The extra 2 units have increased density. Also The building attached to the proposed plan, behind the Bull and Gate, is marked "OFFICE" and is shown as part of the intended future overall development of the area, accessed by the narrow alleyway next to our property. We cannot ignore the extent of disturbance and additional density this brings to the site. The tiny alleyway is completely unsuitable for enabling such expansion.

### **REFUSE AREA**

At last this has appeared on the plan. If there are both recycling and refuse bins together in this limited space for 26 residents, it will prove difficult for the different collectors to access via the external door provided. I would object to any recycling or rubbish being located outside in the alleyway for obvious reasons of noise disturbance, vermin etc. Again this has encroached on and reduced the escape corridor space whilst room has been found to provided 2 extra units!

### **DISABLED ACCESS**

This is poor – there is no single floor accommodation provided. All flats have internal stairs which would require stairlifts for disabled occupants. The current communal corridor widths limit safety and access for wheelchair users, especially in the case of a fire.

### **NOISE**

The kitchens in the new units 12 and 13 are sited on the first floor. We really want to have information regarding extraction and ventilation of these too. The Bull & Gate extractor can be heard from our premises.

### **INCOMPLETE INFORMATION**

Full detailed drawings, elevations and cross-sections are missing despite requests. These are vital to provide ourselves and the Council with a true representation of what is intended and the comparative height and light loss impact on the surrounding buildings.

The new designs will have a bearing on windows – a revised roof plan should be supplied. It is not good enough to deny us clarification on these details.

### **VIBRATION and BUILDING DEVELOPMENT WORK**

I have reported during these various applications that our 2<sup>nd</sup> & 3<sup>rd</sup> floor maisonette is prone to tremble intermittently: furniture, floors etc affected, mainly in the evenings. We do not relish building works aggravating any weakness in our property.

SOUND ADVICE ACOUSTICS LTD have based their assessments “on current occupation only” and “with closed windows” Scanning through the report it seems standard, subjective, based on the current readings – not addressing the completed development of 16 units which will have windows open 50% of the year – this makes a difference.

Even with my 2<sup>nd</sup> floor kitchen window (overlooking the site) closed, I can clearly hear an individual conversing on his mobile by the proposed entrance area.

TRANSPORT STATEMENT – ARDENT CONSULTING ENGINEERS allude to conversion of “a single story, double height” building and “ground and first floor of the existing warehouse”. This is misleading – there is no first floor. In fact their description deliberately discards the rise and fall pitches of the current roof which form an attractive shape above a loft like space. Filling the roof gulleys disembarks from the “change of use” application to promote more square metres – and profitability – at the expense of ourselves as neighbours having our light and privacy affected.

3.5 on the TS it states the site “will make use of existing servicing/delivery arrangements for

the site.” One cannot downplay the evident problems presented by the access alleyway. The delivery of building materials, skips, machinery and removal of rubble etc is Part 1. Part 2, after completion, is the bikers battling past the servicing and delivery vehicles which residents will require - having to receive goods alongside the Bull & Gate's timetable of lorry deliveries, bottle recycling etc. The proximity and layout of traffic lights combined with constant pedestrian footfall across the entrance alleyway is a dangerous combination.

5.10 on the TS states: “No additional refuse demand or highway impact should occur”. If this means the refuse lorry collection timetable will not change, despite 26 more residents, I do not agree. The noise and disturbance of increased refuse and recycling bins trundled through the alleyway will impact greatly on us.

TS also expects only “one vehicle delivery per day”, this too is unsupportable in view of a busy gastro pub next door, the likely residential requirements, plus let's not forget the proprietor's commercial “office” marked on the plan in addition to the 13 units in this current application.

In summary, I do not support the proposed changes in this application nor do I agree to the previous prior approval granted to “change of use” application, *Associated Ref: 2016/2779/P* for which drawings, elevations, cross-sections are incomplete and the Fire Officer's Report does not appear.

Yours sincerely

Sandra Julien