| | | | | | Printed on: 10/02/2017 09:05:07 |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
| 2016/6356/P | Richard | Pentonville Road London N1 9NG | 09/02/2017 23:00:08 | OBJ | I believe that there are serious issues with the quality of design that should be thoroughly considered by the planning committee: |
| | | | | | 1. The access to the site is very narrow, and appears to be unsuited to the D1 use proposed at basement level. |
| | | | | | 2. The shared reception area with a single reception desk appears similarly inadequate. |
| | | | | | 3. The bicycle storage provision appears similarly constrained - aside from bicycles in the main entrance, others would have to navigate a narrow corridor and access to lift. I wonder if any of the |
| | | | | | bicycle storage is BREEAM compliant also? |
| | | | | | 4. Means of escape from GF office areas appear to be very long, and with no alternative escape route. |
| | | | | | Escape from roof terraces looks particularly concerning. Has building control reviewed the proposals? |
| | | | | | 5. The structural grid appears to be poorly resolved with the office layout and often with little relation to the wall locations or consideration of office layout. |
| | | | | | 6. The servicing proposals with bins at basement level seem also poorly considered and likely to cause |
| | | | | | issues for servicing - when will be bins be put out and where will they be located whist waiting for collection? |
| | | | | | I note that a lot of local residents also are concerned by loss of daylight, and this should also be brought to consideration in the narrow cobbled streets around the property. |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | I am deeply concerned by the overall quality of this planning application and some of fundamentals of design and would urge you to refuse the application on these grounds. |