

Enirayetan, Oluwaseyi

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 November 2016 15:59
To: Cassidy, Michael
Subject: 5-17 Haverstock Hill

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Michael Cassidy

I wish to express my objections to the proposed development at the above address, the site which is also known as the "Etons Garages".

The planned building is at least two stories too tall. It will dwarf the adjacent buildings and cause a catastrophic loss of light to the residents on the that side of Eton Place. Furthermore the area is ill-equipped to cope with this number of new dwellings. There is insufficient parking space in the Controlled Parking Zone, which is already overcrowded. A development on this scale should not be allowed to proceed.

Additionally, the architectural style of the new building is out of place in this area. It will spoil the Etons Conservation Area and be completely inappropriate alongside the listed tube station next door.

For these reasons I urge you to refuse this planning application.

Yours sincerely
Colin Ludlow
32 Eton Hall
London
NW3 2DP

Enirayetan, Oluwaseyi

From: Cowen, Janet [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 November 2016 18:54
To: Cassidy, Michael
Subject: Objections to the proposed development at 5-17 Haverstock Hill, London NW3 2BP

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr Cassidy,

I wish to raise objections to this proposed development on grounds of scale, external appearance, type and extent.

The proposed design and materials take no account of the adjoining Grade II listed Chalk Farm underground station, and are unsympathetic to the position of the site in question, namely at the entrance to Eton College Road.

Furthermore, the lack of provision for service and deliveries to the proposed development would lead to an unacceptable increase of congestion at a junction which is already heavily used by both traffic and pedestrians, especially at certain times of day.

The loss of a parade of local shops would mean the loss of a valuable amenity for both travellers and local residents, as well as a reduction in the type of small independent business which the Council should be promoting.

And finally the proposed number of affordable housing units falls most disappointingly below the expected target for new developments.

For these reasons I would urge that the proposal in its present form be not approved, but that the proposed development should be subject to new design to bring it into accord with the character of the area and with the desirable goals of any new housing development.

I write as a resident of Eton College Road.

Yours faithfully,

Janet Cowen

--
Janet Cowen
[REDACTED]

Enirayetan, Oluwaseyi

From: JMR-NERA [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 November 2016 18:53
To: Cassidy, Michael
Subject: The Planning Project 5-17 Haverstock Hill

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr Cassidy,

Following my letter to you regarding the planning of the area in the title to this email: -

I have heard that there is to be a meeting soon on the project 5-17 Haverstock Hill for those neighbours of the site who have written to you re the planning application (as I did) and as there are so many neighbours who feel very much affected by the work envisaged on the site I would like very much to be able to attend the meeting. I have serious reservations regarding the plans as I have seen them and it would help very much to know what other neighbours are thinking. Please tell me the date of the meeting and where it is to be held.

I live a stone's throw from the Eton College Road end of the site and in addition I am nearly eighty-eight years of age. The work is likely to have a bad effect on my health (I am asthmatic) and on my way of life and is likely to reduce the value of my flat seriously, making it difficult to escape the problems by moving into a home or going somewhere else where I shall have less dust in the air while the building is being pulled down. I moved into this flat with my new husband in 1971 so my roots here are considerable.

The flats here have air bricks as well as ducts leading into the individual hallways as well as into the corridors where the front doors are. This means that the dusty air will enter every part of the flat even though the windows might be kept constantly closed (!). What an unhealthy way to have to live!! If we block them off we shall have NO AIR at all in the flats or common corridors.

LIGHT: A few years ago Haverstock School was rebuilt. They didn't inform us that they were seeking planning permission. The first I knew of it was building it by the road – not quite a way back as it was. As I result I lost about two hours of early morning light. Now a 7-storey building is wanted on our side of Haverstock Hill which is taller than our building and is likely to cause another hour or two loss of morning light to my flat.

Many new buildings are built within the shell of the old which would produce a building of flats in a similar style to ours and would be more harmonious with our area. The new plans are ugly and quite out of harmony with our lovely flats. It would spoil the general appearance of the neighbourhood.

I hope these points will be taken into consideration and that I shall be invited to the meeting I have heard about by hearsay.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Jessie M Redfern (Mrs)
17 Eton Place,
Eton College Road,
LONDON, NW3 2BT

Enirayetan, Oluwaseyi

From: Ruth Merrian [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 November 2016 15:25
To: Cassidy, Michael
Cc: Planning
Subject: 11087 - 5-17 Haverstock Hill, London NW3 2BP

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr Cassidy

Further to my letter of 21 November, I understand the public meeting that was due to take place on 24 November was cancelled or, for whatever reason, did not take place. Despite this, the application is to be considered at a planning meeting on 16 December.

This email is to confirm that I have still not received from either your office or directly from Point 2 Surveyors, a window plan that cross references the technical results in Appendix B of the Point 2 Surveyor's Daylight and Sunlight report.

Without the window plan, the Daylight and Sunlight report is meaningless. I fail to understand how the application can be taken to Committee, without a report that neighbours can understand, let alone a practitioner like myself.

Regards

John Carter FRICS
Brooke Vincent and Partners

Enterprise House
2 The Crest
London NW4 2HW
T. [REDACTED]
M. [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

London Borough of Camden
Planning Services
C/o Town Hall
Judd Street
London
WC1H 9JE

Our Ref: JC/RMM/500

Date: 21 November 2016

For the attention of Mr Michael Cassidy

Dear Sirs

5-17 Haverstock Hill, London NW3 2BP – Planning Reference 2016/3975/P

I act for Ms Dawn Kravitz, the owner of 8 Eton Place, Eton College Road. This ground floor flat is sited almost immediately adjacent to the development site and the majority of its windows look directly towards the development site.

Ms Kravitz is concerned that this development would be the cause of an adverse effect to her daylight and sunlight, which would be contrary to Camden's policies as further detailed below.

Policy CS5 – Managing the Impact of Growth and Development

The Council will protect the amenities of Camden's residents, and those working in and visiting the Borough by:

- e) Making sure that the impact of developments on their occupiers and neighbours is fully considered;

Policy DP26 – Managing the Impact of Development on Occupiers and Neighbours

The Council will protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity. The factors we will consider include:

- c) Sunlight, daylight and artificial light levels.

It has been noted that one of the documents submitted with the planning application is a daylight and sunlight report, produced by Point 2 Surveyors dated July 2016. You will be aware that for some weeks, I have been seeking the window plan that is not included in the Daylight and Sunlight report, and this renders the report meaningless. There are many pages of results under the heading of Eton Place and windows/rooms have been given a reference or designation, but there is no means of identifying a location for each reference.



RICS

Directors: David Sirman MRICS Andrew Cornick BSc(Hons) MRICS Consultant: John Carter FRICS
Brooke Vincent + Partners is the trading name of Brooke Vincent Limited, a company
Registered in England and Wales No. 6009355. Registered address as above

I have also sought this information directly from Point 2 Surveyors but again, without success. I am forced to ask why not?

I have inspected my client's flat and considered the proposed development in relation to the existing buildings at 5-17 Haverstock Hill. It is possible that I have understood which results refer to Ms Kravitz's flat but for the reasons I have already explained, I cannot be certain.

I make no reference to the bathroom window as this serves a non-habitable space. However there are living room, kitchen and bedroom windows that face the development and these would undoubtedly be affected by a loss of light.

Such is the enlargement of the proposed development in relation to the existing buildings at the junction of Eton College Road and Adelaide Road, that by reference to the VSC values (daylight at the face of the window), the front living room window would receive an 18.22% reduction in light. This is close to the allowable reduction of 20%, as defined by BRE Guidelines. However, the second living room window, which directly faces the proposed development, has a loss of 44.46%. This is more than double the allowable limit and taken overall there will be an adverse effect to the daylight serving this room. This is further confirmed by the ADF calculation (a more comprehensive daylight appraisal than VSC). Although not recommended by BRE for use with neighbouring buildings, the ADF result shows that the value for the living room, at 1.2% in the proposed condition, would be substantially less than the BRE recommended value of 1.5%.

In the kitchen, the VSC value is reduced by 26.37%, which is substantially greater than the allowable figure of 20% and there would be an adverse effect. This is further confirmed by the ADF value which is reduced to 0.9%, compared to the recommended value of 2.0%.

In the bedroom that faces the proposed development, the VSC value will be reduced by a very substantial 36.02%, almost double the loss that would define an adverse effect. This is very serious.

Very large percentage losses follow through to the analysis of daylight distribution within each room. The results confirm losses of 31.1% and 26.3% for the kitchen and bedroom respectively, both of which, once again, confirm an adverse effect.

The Sunlight Analysis reveals a total of sunlight to the kitchen, which would be a real loss of amenity and an almost total loss of sunlight to the bedroom.

The proposed building is sited nearer my client's flat and will be to a greater height than the existing building. These two factors create a sense of enclosure and inevitably reduce daylight. As we have seen, these facts are also the cause of a total loss of sunlight availability to the kitchen and very nearly a total loss to a bedroom.

There really can only be one conclusion. If this development is approved, it would have a major effect on the amenity of both daylight and sunlight to my client's flat. This is entirely at variance with the two policies that are intended to protect a neighbour's amenity, including daylight and sunlight.

A further outcome would be the greater sense of enclosure that this development would cause to Flat 8. With all these adverse factors, I trust that your report to committee will recommend refusal.

Yours faithfully,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

John Carter FRICS
For and on behalf of
Brooke Vincent + Partners

email:

A black rectangular redaction box covering the email address.

Enirayetan, Oluwaseyi

From: John Carter <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 08 November 2016 11:56
To: Cassidy, Michael
Cc: Planning; Dawn Kravitz
Subject: RE: 5-17, Haverstock Hill NW3 2BP

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Mr Cassidy,
Can you please confirm that you have requested a window plan that cross references the results in the Daylight/sunlight report to neighbouring residential buildings.
I, as an experienced practitioner, can't make sense of the report as submitted and so my client, along with all other neighbouring residents cannot hope to make reasoned comment.
You will appreciate that time is of the essence and I look forward to receiving confirmation that this information has been made available.

Regards,
John Carter
Brooke Vincent and Partners
Enterprise House
The Crest
London NW4 2HN
T: [REDACTED]
M: [REDACTED]

From: John Carter
Sent: 01 November 2016 17:29
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: 5-17, Haverstock Hill NW3 2BP

Mr Cassidy,
I act for Dawn Kravitz, the owner of 8 Eton Place, Eton College Road.
Ms Kravitz contacted me, as a surveyor who deals with daylight and sunlight for planning purposes, on a daily basis. Ms Kravitz is convinced that this development would be the cause of an adverse effect to her daylight and sunlight. These are both amenities which Camden seek to protect through their Policy CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development. This policy confirms: "The Council will protect the amenity of Camden's residents and those working in and visiting the borough by:
e) making sure that the impact of developments on their occupiers and neighbours is fully considered;..."
I note the correct procedure has been followed with a Daylight and Sunlight report submitted in relation to neighbouring properties. Unfortunately, this report is devoid of any means of referencing the windows under consideration. No reference is made to individual flats within Eton Place, which I can understand but there is no window plan to identify the window references in the results table.
Can you please request this vital information, so that I, my client and anybody else, can understand the impact the proposed development will have on neighbouring buildings. Certainly a visual review of the modelling within the report suggests the proposed building is so much larger than the existing building, that an adverse effect on the daylight to my client's flat is a likelihood and the outcome would be unacceptable.
I look forward to you making the relevant request and forwarding this to me, followed by confirmation of its receipt and uploading onto the planning application folder.
Regards,
John Carter

John Carter
Brooke Vincent and Partners
Enterprise House
The Crest
London NW4 2HN
T [REDACTED]
M [REDACTED]